CHRISTENDOM

VOLUME XIII AUTUMN, 1948 NUMBER 4

AN OVER-ALL APPRAISAL OF AMSTERDAM AND ITS RESULTS

BY DOUGLAS HORTON

BY perseverance and sacrifice beyond all praise, the people of the Netherlands have restored their country from the state of starvation and exhaustion which prevailed in 1945 to something like its normal condition of industry and happy social life. Even in these circumstances, however, the Protestant Churches of the country exhibited the most courageous kind of hospitality in being willing to shoulder the enormous burden of entertaining the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in the summer of 1948.

The city of Amsterdam was in gala mood at the time, for following hard upon the Assembly — indeed before it was quite over — came the birthday of Queen Wilhelmina and, on her formal abdication six days later, the accession of Queen Juliana. The gaily colored streamers decorating the buildings, the lights on the canals at night, the milling throngs of visitors from the countryside, sustained in the delegates as they entered the streets from the hall of meeting the same sense of event that they felt in the meetings themselves.

The citizens of Amsterdam on their part, for all their holiday spirit, were by no means unaware that the Assembly was being held. Many hundreds, if not thousands, gathered outside the cathedral-like thirteenth-century *Nieuwe Kerk* (*New* Church!) to witness the arrival, for the opening service of worship, of the 351 delegates, 238 alternates, and innumerable accredited and other visitors from 147 denominations and 44 countries. Those who were able to obtain places within the church saw the solemn procession of the delegates down the middle aisle of the nave to seats in the transepts, the clergy clad in their various, and some of them splendid, robes of worship.

The interest of the citizens was again drawn to the Assembly when

the Princess Juliana herself, and Prince Bernhard, attended a plenary session at the *Concertgebouw* and sat, with apparent enjoyment, possibly steeled with a sense of *noblesse oblige,* through an afternoon of theological disquisition. This was at the beginning of the Assembly. Toward the end, at another of the plenary sessions, the great company turned from its fixed labors to witness the formal presentation to Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, from an emissary of the queen, of a letter and insignia announcing his appointment as a Knight of the Order of the Netherlands Lion. To this order only those who have distinguished themselves by unusual public service are admitted. The sustained applause from the delegates attested their agreement with the terms of the presentation, which described the World Council as the most promising new development in Christendom and Dr. Visser 't Hooft, its general secretary, as the person chiefly responsible for its emergence into actuality.

The list of the names of other men and women responsible for the success of the Assembly would cover pages of this Quarterly. There could have been no meeting of the Assembly at all if Henry Smith Leiper, for instance — and others — had not devoted their promotional gifts to the raising of the budget. The wheels of the day-by-day program could hardly have turned had it not been for the constant and instant attention of such men as Dr. Ekering and Baron van Tuyll of the local Dutch committee on arrangements, and Robert S. Bilheimer of the United States, loaned to the Geneva office to prepare for and supervise the behind-scenes administration at the Assembly. As one of the editorials in the *Assembly News* put it:

> To accommodate 1,400 people in Amsterdam at a time of national festivities was a feat in itself; to organize the great *Concertgebouw* as a meeting and working headquarters was another feat; but to do all this and everything else in three languages adds admiration to respect for those "back room" people who kept the machine moving. The complicated series of meetings (there were really three assemblies to organize — the main assembly, the visitors', and the youth assemblies), sections, and committees were a bewildering jigsaw puzzle to many, but the puzzle was fitted.

In his massive *History of the Christian Councils,* Bishop Hefele lists among the occasions for convoking great councils of the Church, the following three:

When a dangerous heresy or schism has arisen:
When it is a question of the reformation (or renewal) of the Church:

When the question is whether to decide upon some great and universal undertaking.

In the light of these reasons for calling together an ecumenical gathering, it is possible to appraise the Amsterdam Assembly.

I

The chief heresy in the world today, from the point of view of Amsterdam, a heresy which has caused endless little schisms and is the basis of the largest and most critical schism of them all — that between Rome and the rest of Christendom — is the spirit of non-co-operation. The Assembly laid a plan for the cure of the little schisms, and held the door wide open for Rome.

Rome was not officially or unofficially represented at the Assembly. Undoubtedly the Holy See will have a full account of it, both from the printed reports and from observers in the neighborhood who would have had opportunity to discuss it with Protestant friends who attended. But, though early invited to participate in the movement which led up to the great meeting, Rome was not there. As recently as June fifth of this year the Holy Office at Rome, in a formal "warning" published in Latin, bade its priests and laymen throughout the world cease taking part in public meetings where conflicting religious views are exchanged in an effort to reunite Christianity.

Many of the small fundamentalist churches were not represented. From August 12 to 19, the week before the Assembly began, a small "international council" of fundamentalist churches was held in Amsterdam itself, chiefly under American initiative, "in opposition to the World Council of Churches."

One fears that Amsterdam did not move one positive step in the direction of healing either of these two breaches. It is difficult to know how it could. The burden of proof seems to be upon Rome and the fundamentalists. That these bodies have a right to decline to co-operate with others, who would deny? But if they refuse even to *meet* with another Christian group, how can they know that the other is really unworthy of being accorded co-operation? There is precedent for meeting even with publicans and sinners.

The Moscow Patriarchate of the Orthodox Church and the other patriarchates of countries more or less closely connected with Russia were not represented at the Assembly, but not for the *a priori* reasons which deterred Rome and the fundamentalists. An official letter from

Moscow indicated that their absence was due to the alleged "political and non-religious aim" of the World Council. However another letter stressed the interest of the Muscovite Church in true ecumenicity and asked that it be kept in touch with the World Council through literature and periodicals and other appropriate means. Since the World Council of Churches is definitely, resolutely, and implacably bent upon *not* becoming a political organization, it may fairly be said that the present attitude of the Russian Church is based upon ignorance. Some of the delegates believed that the Russian statement was the compensatory kind which might be expected from a Church which, tied too close to a totalitarian state, had a bad ecclesiastical conscience. Those who knew the situation best, however, seemed to feel that once Moscow learned the real aims of the World Council it would accept membership in it and take the place reserved for its delegate on the Central Committee of ninety. Certainly none were inclined to brand Moscow with the stigma of non-co-operation without further proof.

The Council asked whether it itself were guilty of the heresy of non-co-operation in ruling out of possible membership such churches as would not accept its formula of belief in Jesus Christ "as God and Saviour." This phrase has been sharply criticized both from the theological right and from the left. A letter of the late Archbishop Temple is extant in which he points out that the formulation cannot have been meant to be theological at all, so obviously bad is the theology involved. The World Council, according to its present constitution, can accept as a member a church which believes neither in God the Father nor in the Holy Spirit, except as they are comprehended in the work of Christ. This highly Christocentric formulation of the basis of membership has kept out of the Council the Church of Czechoslovakia and at least one of the groups of the Society of Friends. But it is a mark of the spirit of non-co-operation?

Doubtless the formula should be altered in the direction of an ampler Trinitarianism — and the Assembly laid plans for a study to that end. Yet the formula, or something equally strong, can hardly be dispensed with if the Council is to keep its character. The Council obviously requires a basis of membership and quite as obviously must take as its basis some standard which is accepted as Christian by all the members. If it does less, it will lessen or destroy the co-operation among those members, and so defeat the end of co-operation itself. To prove that it is not now non-co-operative even toward those communions

which cannot accept its formula, it invites their duly appointed representatives to its Assembly, seats them as official observers, and so accords them every possible recognition.

As a matter of fact the first triumph of the Amsterdam Assembly is its blasting of the heresy of non-co-operation over a very wide area of the Church. Representatives of communions separated by non-acquaintance if not by non-recognition for almost a thousand years sat down together. They did more: they solemnly affirmed that they intend to stay together. Theological differences remain: cultural differences, political differences, remain: the Anglicans have a separate communion table: so do the Orthodox: but transcending all, written across the sky of their hopes, is their word, *We intend to stay together.* The Amsterdam Assembly was the embodiment of the idea of Christian co-operation on a world scale. As one observer put it: "Church isolation is over. Amsterdam put it out of court. It did not kill it. It is still there and likely to appear at intervals. But no church jealous of its reputation can again presume to be entirely self-sufficient in faith and practice. It needs the other members of the household of faith."

II

The Assembly realized perfectly, from its presidents to its last visitor (if he stayed long enough to catch its insights), that the Church is in need of reformation or, more accurately, renewal. The zeal of the delegates for the union of the Church burned no more warmly than their zeal for the Church's inner renewal — and, as a group, they took the one step which they could take toward effecting that inner renewal: they opened themselves to the influence of the Inner Renewer.

Karl Barth sounded the note of this necessity almost at the outset:

> I do not wish to weaken the earnestness, the good will, and the hopes that have brought us here, but only to base them on their proper foundation. We ought to give up every thought that the care of the Church, the care of the world, is our care. Burdened with this thought, we should straighten out nothing, we should only increase the disorder in Church and world still more. For just this is the final root and ground of all human disorder, the dreadful, godless, ridiculous opinion that man is the Atlas who is destined to bear the dome of heaven on his shoulders. What we can and ought to do in these days is simply this: we must give our churches and the world a proof "in spirit and in power" of how it is when a thousand Christians from all lands and peoples, of all tongues and confessions, gathered together in one congregation under present prevailing conditions, stand by what they have so often heard and preached in

their several positions and various styles: "Commit thy way unto the Lord and trust in Him, and *He* will bring it to pass."

There were many who expected the Assembly to move much further in the direction of the renewal of the Church than simply to offer itself to God. There were those who expected legislation which would directly or indirectly affect the communions involved — but the World Council is prevented by its very constitution from invading the spiritual freedom of its constituent bodies by any such means. There were those who expected that somehow the Kingdom of Heaven would advance visibly nearer to realization as a result of the action of the Assembly — forgetting the word of Jesus about the mustard seed and its very gradual growth. Some of the reporters (two hundred of them, who watched the delegates from their platform gallery "as hunters a herd of mountain goats") expected something more reportable or even photogenic than prayers, theological conceptions, or parliamentary resolutions. (It is to be remarked, however, that few if any of the representatives of the press sought the sensational.) All these expectations were necessarily disappointed.

The people who were not disappointed were those who expected the Assembly to be a revival service of a subtle sort. It was far from being a revival service of the form commonly known.

There was no professional revivalist among the scores of speakers at the plenary sessions, which were held on the first few and last few days of the Assembly. Though there were many great utterances on these occasions, they were great in the sense of being greatly thought out rather than greatly moving. The speakers' knowledge that they must be understood by three different language-groups tended to confine them to simple declarative sentences and to deprive them of the nicer uses of word and phrase which, with untranslatable connotations, reach deepest into the emotions. But since speech after speech was oriented toward God, the total cumulative experience of the hearer was one of being slowly but definitely invaded by Christian conviction.

The complaint was sometimes heard that the speeches borrowed largely from the language of theology. It is said that there are three peculiar kinds of English — Oxonian English, American English, and Conference English. The English of an international church conference is likely to be theological for the simple reason that theology furnishes the only available *lingua franca.* Theologians read each other's books, whatever language they may be written in. Living in the same

world, therefore, and using the same sets of ideas, they come to a conference not feeling strange toward each other and not lacking a medium through which to make themselves mutually understood. No other group enjoys these advantages. It is hardly to be wondered at that, in consequence, they tend to draw the entire conference into their orbit. Theological cant is inexcusable anywhere — and there was surprisingly little of that — but theological language at its best (it need not be technical) has the effect already referred to: it revives and reinforces one's Christian conviction. So it did at Amsterdam.

There were high moments at the plenary sessions. On Monday, August 23, Dr. Marc Boegner of Paris, one of the presidents of the Council in process of formation, proposed in his stately French "that the formation of the World Council be declared to be and is hereby completed." After a long period of hand-clapping, the crowded assembly rose, stood in silence, and was led in prayer. Men glanced at their watches to note the very minute at which the Council had finally come into being. This was one of those moments into which God seems to crowd all of past history into a flash of consummation.

Another high moment — into which the delegates felt that God was crowding all of history yet to come — was that which closed the last plenary session. There it was felt, as the Christians of the first Pentecost must have felt it, that the Assembly was not a terminus but a starting point. The eyes of all were on the future. Then the appropriateness of the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury became clear:

> In one sense, we are looking for trouble. We are taking the risk which all men take when they invite the living God into closer touch with their lives. We cannot tell what God will do with us, but we can be sure that He will not leave us unchanged.

These moments had their part in the renewal of spiritual apprehension which was Amsterdam. Equally important, however, were the contacts afforded by the smaller meetings. The Assembly followed the practice of every great council after Nicaea in dividing the delegates into groups to consider specific questions and report later to the whole body. This assembly was, in fact, divided into two sets of groups. In the mornings of the middle days it met in "sections" which drew up pronouncements on various subjects, and in the afternoon of the same days in "committees" which considered practical matters having to do with the life of the Council itself.

At the end of the first two days of discussion, many of these group

meetings seemed to be getting nowhere. It would have been difficult to say whether their presiding officers or their members were the more discouraged. However, as the participants became better acquainted with each other and with each other's points of view on particular issues, the more constructive minds were able to glimpse ways of stating if not synthesizing the differences; and findings which paid decent respect to the opinions of all began to shape themselves. No attempt at complete unanimity was made: no plaint of any minority was outlawed. The Holy Spirit ruled.

(A legend of the first great ecumenical council at Nicaea, held in the year 325, states that each time the delegates left the place of meeting 319 of them were counted, whereas they were only 318 when they took their seats. At last it became manifest that the 319th member must be the Holy Ghost! It is to be feared that the adding machines and other modern efficiency devices used at Amsterdam precluded any such interesting variation in the count in 1948 — but of the presence of the Holy Spirit, guiding the Assembly into truth and imparting His peculiar gifts, there can be no doubt.)

At the time, the members of the various groups were too fully occupied with the subjects in hand to realize that a delicate reorientation was taking place within them. They were actually, under the guidance of the Spirit, becoming members of a World Church, itself in process of formation. To listen to a Quaker respond to a metropolitan of the Syrian Church of Malabar was to realize something of the variety which would be contained within that Church. To rub elbows with men who had spent years in prison camps for conscience' sake was to realize the aboundingness of that Church, in which martyrdom seems only to add strength to faith. To sit under the trenchant criticism of a dark-skinned emissary from one of the younger churches of the Orient was to realize the diffusion of that Church. To talk with men and women who had stood up against organized atheism was to realize the insurgence of that Church, its faith rising above every type of skepticism and capable of thrusting an edge of light into any kind of spiritual darkness. To turn from one layman, an engineer, to another layman, a lawyer (though there were too few laymen at Amsterdam), each ready with his peculiar testimony, was to realize the relevance of that Church for all the relations of man and man. To sit for even a little while in one of the discussion groups where people of such intricate differences were being fashioned into a community by a Living Presence was to

participate in the beginning of a drama whose splendid denouement one could only dream of — and determine to advance.

The services of worship added similarly to the renewal of the faith of those gathered at Amsterdam, and to the renewal of the Church at large.

If then the question is asked: what did the Assembly do toward renewing the Church, one can respond that it at least faced in the right direction. It recognized that reform can come from God alone, and it looked toward him. To a certain degree he began his reformation then and there, showing them the possibilities of his future.

III

Did the Assembly decide upon any "great and universal undertaking"? It decided upon establishing the World Council of Churches, which might seem a sufficient crusade in itself. It went further, however, and implemented its theme, "Man's Disorder and God's Design" by setting up undertakings directed toward submitting man's disorder to God's design in at least four areas.

1. The Assembly regarded evangelization as the first task of the Church and authorized the appointment of a secretary to be concerned with it. He is not to conduct evangelistic campaigns, but to assist the various member communions in laying and co-ordinating their own plans for evangelization. The locus for the extension of the Kingdom is no longer merely "the foreign field." It is the educated classes. It is people of great wealth. It is labor. It is the unchristianized and dechristianized world wherever it is found at home and abroad.

2. The Assembly recognized that the work of ecumenical relief cannot be given up for years to come. Certain types of relief, such as the feeding of the starving (in distinction to the hungry, of whom there remain hundreds of millions), are no longer called for. The refugee problem, on the other hand, has not yet reached its peak.

The speech of the Rev. Elfan Rees, the director of the Refugee Division of the Reconstruction Department of the World Council, was one of the most gripping imaginable, owing its power to the unescapableness of the facts it presented.

> When the war ended in 1945, there were nine million displaced persons in Europe — one of the largest and one of the most dreadful of Europe's legacies from National Socialism. . . . In the almost three years that have passed, more than seven million of these people have been returned to their homes and

countries — a very fine and remarkable achievement. . . . But while the relief machinery of the victorious powers was solving one problem, the political machinery of the same powers was creating a similar one, that today leaves us with not less than fourteen million homeless people in Europe.

For the displaced person, this is the Year of Misery. This is the year his distress mounts to its climax. Only one million are eligible for United Nations care, for the International Refugee Organization is precluded by its charter from dealing with people whose condition as refugees is our fault. The task is plainly one for the Church, and for the Church acting ecumenically. Interdenominational co-operation alone can meet and mollify this vast agony. Of that the delegates at Amsterdam were sure. They made provision for an ongoing Department of Reconstruction. But our American churches, alone of all the churches of the world, are equipped to give aid that begins to be adequate. If they do not respond, ecumenicity's relief work, which has been its glory, must become its shame.

3. Not the least "great and universal undertaking" for which the Assembly assumed responsibility was that of ecumenical education. The labors of the Study Department in preparation for Amsterdam were herculean. It would be hard to find sufficient superlatives to celebrate the success of those who labored, in many lands, to produce the books preliminary to the Council, under the chairmanship of President Van Dusen. This advance plowing of the field of thought made possible the rich harvest of the Section meetings at Amsterdam. It is proposed to carry this kind of work on with even greater intensity.

The Study Department to date has been of, by, and for the learned. So have the study committees of the Faith and Order movement. The educational activity of the World Council has been like the New Jerusalem: it has been in process of descending out of heaven, where, until recently, it has been at the celestial level beloved of theologians. Discussions at this level are absolutely prerequisite to all good subsequent religious thought — but the Council has never forgotten that the destination of its education is the same as that of the Holy City: the tabernacle of God is to be *with men*. So today it is conducting the Ecumenical Institute in Bossey, near Geneva, Switzerland, for laymen: so it is building up its youth education through the appropriate department: and these are to be carried on in strength, according to the vote at Amsterdam.

4. The Church Commission on International Affairs is the agency through which the World Council pursues its "great and universal undertaking" to increase the peace and abolish war. It has no naive ideas about this matter, however. It recognizes that the Church has made little or no contribution to the solving of the war problem. It recognizes that the Christianity of the churches has largely been national in thought and organization. And yet the Church is seen as the key to the problem. "Until now international affairs either through diplomacy or the League of Nations or the United Nations have been conducted without any real basis in the minds and hearts of the people." The ecumenical Church can provide that basis. It can develop a fellowship in Christ upon which alone a partnership of the nations can rest. That is the task which the Council sets for itself.

So the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches has come and gone. Athanasius in his letter to the bishops of Africa said of the first ecumenical council, "What God hath spoken through the Council of Nicaea endureth for ever." What can be said of this last ecumenical council? Will its words endure? Will they spread to local congregations, reinforcing the faith of the believers, creating new expressions of Christian love, heartening maturity and inspiring youth? Only the local congregations can answer.

THE THEOLOGICAL ATMOSPHERE AT AMSTERDAM

By EDWIN E. AUBREY

IMPRESSIONS given so quickly must necessarily be superficial. Writing, as I am, immediately after the Assembly with only a few days to meet the publication deadline, one cannot gain the perspective of distance. Furthermore many of the points made here would have been clarified by more exact reference back to the documents of Oxford and the intervening studies; and this is not possible when one writes between meetings and away from his own study.

To speak of an atmosphere or a climate of a two-weeks' conference is to suggest the effects of disturbances in the air coming from afar, as well as the immediate local conditions including the previous weather. In the words of weather forecasting, the theological atmosphere of Amsterdam was overcast, with variable winds and (as the British forecasters say) occasional bright periods.

I

Much had happened since the conferences at Oxford and Edinburgh. The Nazis, already well entrenched in 1937, were in two years to embark upon their ill-fated *Blitzkrieg;* and the subsequent revelations of the depths to which human nature could fall were a telling reminder of the reality of sin. At the same time, the Christian churches had shown an unsuspected power of resistance, and while the blood of martyrs was shed again the churches recovered the meaning of faith in God when human resources seem to be exhausted. Moreover, the European churches were shaken out of their social indifference and forced to reckon with problems of practical strategy and moral principle in the realms of politics, economics, race relations, family life and personal vocation. They saw a Christian culture disintegrate.

Comparable to the struggle with Nazism in Germany and the occupied countries is the present controversy over communism. The political and economic struggle between Russia and the Western Powers has divided the churches in their judgments. To Anglo-American groups the dangers of communism are more obvious than they are to

central Europeans who see Western imperialism as a grave evil also. Oriental countries, on the other hand, are still more acutely conscious of Western exploitation, and more ready than either Europeans or Americans to admit communistic views into harmony with Christian faith. If the German confessional churches were absent at Oxford the Eastern Orthodox churches of the Russian-dominated areas were absent at Amsterdam. It is not surprising if the communist ideology again and again became an issue in the Assembly this year.

But there were important differences between 1937 and 1948. For one thing — and a great thing — the World Council of Churches had come into being and had functioned vigorously even while "in process of formation." All through the war exchange of ideas between Christians was maintained, often *sub rosa* and at grave personal risk. The sense of fellowship was developed further by postwar programs of reconstruction and relief, and by the ecumenical institutes held at Bossey in Switzerland. Meanwhile Christian groups all over the world were debating and deciding their relation to the World Council of Churches. The word "ecumenical" began to be known and understood by the general membership of the churches. And then, the continuing exchange among Christian scholars through the Study Department increased mutual theological understanding. Emil Brunner said to me, on his return after the war to lecture in the United States, that he was astonished at the increase of interest in theology in Christian circles. Here the writings of Brunner and Reinhold Niebuhr made a real contribution in mediating to Americans and Britishers the assimilable aspects of the theology of crisis, which at Oxford was such a strange and annoying phenomenon to Anglo-Saxons.

The effects of all these long-range factors were felt at Amsterdam. Continental Europeans were somewhat better understood even in their most exasperating moments. A consciousness of deeper unity was manifest. On their side the Europeans were more receptive to Anglo-Saxon insistence on social action. In a word, the sharpness of the regional cleavage was considerably softened.

In composition the Amsterdam Assembly was a combination of Oxford and Edinburgh. Here "Faith and Order," emphasizing the internal relations of the churches in matters of doctrine and polity, and "Life and Work," stressing the external contacts of churches with the problems of society, were both under consideration together, with mutually enriching results. The delegates were official representatives

of their churches, and as such felt more deeply the responsibility really to represent their communions. This had the effect of making them more conservative in ecumenical expression since they felt the obligation to bring the special witness of their own groups to bear in the discussions. While relatively few were laymen actually engaged in secular occupations (perhaps about fifteen per cent), these lent a note of realism and caution to many analyses of and prescriptions for the secular tasks of society.

The Assembly's discussion groups were so organized that the alternates had their own meetings and the youth theirs, but careful provision was made for constant liaison between the three parallel series of considerations of the same general topics. As a consequence, the delegates in the plenary sessions were confronted with final reports for which non-delegates had been able to make valuable suggestions. There was also daily clearance between the four major sections — dealing respectively with the nature of the church, the task of evangelism, the disorders of modern society, and international affairs. This also helped to integrate the total body of thought and to keep the various emphases in proper relation to each other. None will forget, either, the participation of men whose names had become familiar to us as "heroes of the faith," and whose theology took on a new and deeper meaning for the rest of us because of their sufferings: men like Bishop Berggrav of Norway who had barely escaped execution for defiance of the Nazi invaders, Hendrik Kraemer who went to prison in Holland, Bishop Lilje of Germany and Martin Niemoeller. When Berggrav voiced the duty and difficulty of overcoming hate, or when Niemoeller gave a pessimistic view of the social situation, those who listened could no longer dismiss them lightly.

All of these influences told upon the theological atmosphere of the Assembly and gave it a quality hard to convey to anyone not present.

II

There were no glib affirmations of unity at Amsterdam. From the first the sharp differences of viewpoint and approach were evident. Here was a discussion of our relations with the Jews that opened with quotations from the New Testament to show how the Jewish people had in God's providence produced the Messiah and then rejected him, leaving to the Christian Church the task God had given the Jews. A French pastor then argued that, since the rejection of the Christ was

the gravest problem of human history, the Jewish question was central for the interpretation of history. How far this all sounded from the American plans of co-operation with the Jews! Indeed, the same French Protestants insisted that while they might co-operate with Jews on a *humanitarian* basis in facing common social problems, they could not do so on the *religious* basis of a common God and the same moral values.

Behind this lay a view of the Bible which was never fully discussed at the meetings: the view that the Bible is a unity all of which must be interpreted in terms of the revelation in Jesus Christ, and all parts of which have positive significance in this context. Though very close to Biblical literalism this was subtly differentiated from fundamentalism by its free acceptance of historical criticism. Yet it was something different from the familiar view of "the mind of Christ" as the norm for understanding the Scriptures. Said Barth, "I do not want your 'minds'!" He himself shocked many in the discussion of the place of women in the church by seriously contending for the subordination of women, and he seemed to relish the vigorous dissent which greeted him. Again and again the starting point for discussion of the most practical problems of social adjustment was found in some Biblical passage; and the more empirical temper of Americans in dealing with such problems was baffled by this approach.

Since most Americans present at Amsterdam were what Europeans call free-churchmen, the bland assurance of ecclesiastical traditionalists proved to be another stumbling block to mutual understanding. When Bishop Meiser of Germany took his stand on the church confessions as the basis for theological thinking, or Father Florovsky declared the unity of the mystical body of Christ and not any agreement on social issues to be the basis of Christian fellowship, then the free-churchmen found themselves perplexed and confused, as they also did when the doctrine of apostolic succession was declared by Anglo-Catholics to be prerequisite to any talk of Christian unity.

Similarly in the area of social problems cleavages of thinking appeared. On the whole the Anglo-American group found itself standing with those from the Far East for a more optimistic view of modern technical civilization, against the European continentals, who claimed that neither of the other groups understood the intrinsic hopelessness of a machine age. When delegates from the "younger churches" voiced their hope that modern technics would deliver their peoples from pov-

erty and starvation, they were told that this was the confidence of inexperience, for they had not yet had enough technical civilization to be caught in its evil toils. On the other hand, Americans sought to give them confidence that the problems of our industrial age, while acute, are not insoluble.

It is not surprising that the extreme eschatological viewpoint should be held by the continentals. Indeed, one of the major developments in European theology during the war was the lifting of this view to the place where the doctrine of the Second Coming came to be regarded, as in the writings of Oscar Cullman, as the central faith of Christianity. Of course not in the form of a crude premillennialism; the idea is that Christ has already established his lordship over history and that this lordship has now to be fulfilled. To this fulfillment we look forward, for it we pray, and in its light we must read all history. For history without this expectancy is meaningless, and time finds its meaning only in Christ in whom eternity and time are brought together.

With the presupposition that some such theological framework was required prior to any fruitful ethical discussions, many Americans and Orientals expressed their impatience. Yet without some such assumption many others did not want to proceed. It was not merely a question of the precise theological assumptions from which all should set forth; but also of the necessity for so elaborate a theological system as an approach to social problems.

III

Yet throughout the Amsterdam meetings, in sections, committees and plenary sessions, there was an astonishingly resolute will to understand each other. This called for imagination as well as logic, since a grasp of another's theological position requires one to accept the genuineness of the religious experience on which it rests. When we forgot this we were frequently misled. In one of the committees the normal logic of the theological premises would have led to anti-semitism; but the advocate of these premises took a very firm stand to the contrary. His deep Christian feeling guided his thinking.

Because of this the periods of worship assumed an added importance for the general theological discussions. Here a level of common experience was reached that undergirded the group as it entered upon the careful discriminations and definitions of ecumenical thinking. Mutual trust was enhanced so that clear differentiation of viewpoints could proceed without fear of dissolving the fellowship.

What many Europeans did not seem to understand was that in a similar way co-operation in practical tasks can produce a basis for deeper understanding and build a comradeship within which honest theological argument can continue fruitfully. In consequence they looked upon American schemes for co-operation between autonomous denominations as shallow pragmatism that refused to face theological issues. This is a misunderstanding that needs to be cleared up, and should be carefully considered by the Study Department.

The fruits of ecumenical fellowship were seen in the drafting of the various statements. Obstacles of language, of religious tradition and of theological orientation that seemed at times insuperable were by mutual trust transcended; and the resulting modifications were gracefully accepted. Readers of these Reports and of the Message will doubtless think them vague and evasive at points. They must remember, however, that the very phrases represent often agreements reached only after careful debate and in a spirit of Christian determination to stay together.

This determination, uttered in the Message, was a pervasive force in all the sessions. Yet it was not a forced attitude. It came from a reverent acknowledgment that God far transcends our formulations, that in Jesus Christ we are held together in a way we do not fully comprehend, and that in a very real sense there exists a universal Church within all our distinctive communions.

IV

A substantial body of common conviction was present despite the expressions of difference.

That God is the lord of history, transcending all human action and standing in judgment upon it, was accepted by all. In the midst of contemporary confusion both inside and outside the church all looked to his mercy as their hope in desperation. The sharp cleavage in much earlier discussion between emphases on the vertical and the horizontal dimensions was overcome in a recognition that both are important in our experience of God.

Jesus Christ was acknowledged to be the center of history and the clue to the meaning of the Bible taken as a whole. Particular methods of interpreting this might vary, ranging from the view, bequeathed to us by Luther, that Christ is the touchstone for appraising the relative importance of various parts of the Scriptures, to the idea that Christ is prefigured everywhere in the Old Testament. But it was generally

agreed that the Christian reads his Bible from that center in Christ, and sees in it a drama of salvation.

While there was considerable range in the view of the potentialities of man, from extreme Barthianism to liberal optimism, no one felt confident that human nature has the power to save itself. The resources for human redemption were sought beyond man.

That there is an eternal element in the church of which its historical forms are imperfect expressions was acknowledged by all; and division was felt to be a scandal. Amsterdam is therefore only a milestone on a long road towards more adequate forms of unity.

Finally the conference was dominated by the conviction that the Kingdom of God is something already introduced by Jesus Christ but not yet realized in full. Whether that fulfillment will come as the working out of a historical process is still a matter of debate among the churches, but that it is not to be confused with some utopian scheme was generally agreed. And despite the differences as to the relation of the Kingdom to history, there was clear agreement that a burden is laid on Christians to work for its coming even though they cannot by their own efforts actually bring it in. It was evident that even an extreme eschatological viewpoint, at least within the ecumenical framework, does not cut the nerve of Christian moral effort.

It would be a great mistake to minimize the differences that exist; but we may also take heart because of the definite growth in mutual respect and understanding that has come about within the ecumenical movement.

FIRST THOUGHTS ON AMSTERDAM AND LAMBETH 1948

By ANGUS DUN

THE editor suggested that this paper might deal with "agreements and disagreements in Faith and Order" emerging out of the discussions at Amsterdam and Lambeth. It can be no more than an attempt to report, with too little perspective, what appears most important from the faith and order standpoint as a result of these two gatherings.

I

With reference to Amsterdam, it must be made clear that it was an "assembly," not a faith and order conference. Of its four major sections, not to mention its seven committees, only one was focused on the problem of the Church and the Churches. Neither the preparatory studies nor the time schedule were such as to make possible a solid carrying forward of the work of Lausanne and Edinburgh. The excellent preparatory volume provided for Section I includes five essays on the nature of the Church from sharply contrasted standpoints. The remainder of the volume deals with the involvement of the Church in the disorder of the world, the evidences of renewal in many places, and concludes with chapters on the problems of the ecumenical movement and the nature and task of the World Council of Churches. The general outline of the volume was accepted as a guide for the discussions of Section I without its being bound in any way to the text.

The time allowed the Section for discussion of this agenda was rigorously rationed. Whereas the Sections at Edinburgh had five or more full days for their assignments, at Amsterdam we had only six sessions of hardly more than two hours each.

Faced with these limitations there were some of us, in the preparatory Commission and in the Section, who urged that we should concentrate on a few uniting affirmations, move on to a forthright confession of the Churches's involvement in the world's wrongs and stress our common tasks and commitments in the World Council. As things developed we became deeply involved in the task of expressing agree-

ments and disagreements in the realm of faith and order, not having time or space to work through to any very satisfactory clarity. So much is said about the conditions under which the report on Section I was produced because it cannot be rightly judged without understanding them.

At the Edinburgh Conference on Faith and Order in 1937 the delegates joined in the affirmation:

> We are one in faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, the incarnate word of God. . . . We are one because we are all the objects of the love and grace of God, and called by Him to witness in all the world to His glorious Gospel. . . . We are convinced that our unity of spirit and aim must be embodied in a way that will make it manifest to the world, though we do not yet clearly see what outward form it should take.

That affirmation was clearly echoed in the Report of Section I at Amsterdam:

> God has given to His people in Jesus Christ a unity which is His creation and not our achievement. We praise and thank Him for this mighty work of His Holy Spirit, by which we have been drawn together to discover that, notwithstanding our divisions, we are one in Jesus Christ. . . . It is in the light of that unity that we can face our deepest differences, still loving one another in Christ and walking by faith in Him alone. . . . Although we cannot fully meet, our Lord will not allow us to turn away from one another. . . . The Body of Christ *is* a unity which makes it impossible for us to either forget each other or to be content with agreement upon isolated points of our belief whilst we leave the other parts unreconciled.

Surely for most of us who were at Amsterdam and entered into a covenant of responsible relationship as representatives of our divided Churches, our being there and our covenant were seen as a giving of some "outward form," however imperfect, to that acknowledged oneness in Christ.

There were times in the discussions of Section I when it seemed that we might be unable to affirm even such unity, and thus to fall short of Edinburgh. That was because it was so plain that to be "in Christ" in its Biblical meaning, is to be in His Body the Church. And just that is what those in some of the Churches represented find it hard to acknowledge concerning those in other Churches.

The affirmation brought honest perplexities to some, yet it stood. And in the "Message" of the Assembly, which was not only "received," as were the Section reports, but "adopted," it was repeated:

> We bless God, our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ who gathers together in one the children of God that are scattered abroad. . . . We are one in acknowledging Him as God and Saviour. We are divided from one another not only in matters of faith, order and tradition, but also by pride of nation, class and race. Christ has made us His own, and He is not divided. In seeking Him we find one another.

It is because we could say such things together that we could meet as those who stood on common ground and talked and prayed together as those who amid the confusion of our human tongues could speak a common language.

A common concern for the Church drew us together, but when we sought for words in which to express our agreements about that Church the difficulties were many. Indeed the very concentration on the nature and mission of the Church accentuated our differences. For, as was recognized at Edinburgh, there is no aspect of faith about which there are more stubborn differences.

Concerning the *nature* of the Church it could be said in the Report of Section I: "We all believe that the Church is God's gift to men for the salvation of the world; that the saving acts of God in Jesus Christ brought the Church into being; that the Church persists in continuity through history through the presence and power of the Holy Spirit." And concerning the *mission* of the Church, it could be said:

> We believe that the Church has a vocation to worship God in His Holiness, to proclaim the Gospel to every creature. She is equipped by God with the various gifts of the Spirit for the building up of the Body of Christ. She has been set apart in holiness to live for the service of all mankind, in faith and love, by the power of the crucified and risen Lord and according to His example. She is composed of forgiven sinners yet partaking already, by faith, in the eternity of the Kingdom of God and waiting for the consummation when Christ shall come again in the fullness of His glory and power.

The fact which perhaps most distinguished the discussions of the Church at Amsterdam from the discussions at Lausanne and Edinburgh was the explicit recognition that, when we have gathered together propositions about the Church on which we can agree, we are still faced with total views of the Church which set every particular statement in a radically different context. As the Report of Section I states it, "there remains a hard core of disagreement between different total ways of apprehending the Church of Christ." "Each of these views sees every part of the Church's life in the setting of the whole, so that even where the parts seem to be similar they are set in a context

which, as yet, we find irreconcilable with the whole context of the other." The Section was disposed to find the most clear cut illustration of this situation in the difference between the meaning of the Church for the "catholic" mind, as represented at Amsterdam by the Orthodox and an important section of Anglicanism, on the one side, and on the other side by the "protestant" mind found in most of the other Churches represented there. Others in the Assembly were not satisfied with this, to them, over simple antithesis, and pressed for the recognition of a third major position suggested by such phrases as "the gathered community" or "the free Church," and found most clearly in Churches of a strongly congregational type. Only time will tell whether an approach to the problems of faith and order along these lines will prove fruitful. Certainly it is true that the propositions about the Church agreed upon at Amsterdam carry very different meanings for an Orthodox, or a "high" Anglican than they carry for a Methodist or a Baptist. Both sides may say from the heart that the Church is God's creation, not ours. But for one the controlling conviction may be that God created a corporate body with certain institutions to which He has pledged Himself for all time, while for the others the governing conviction may be that God has called into being and continues to call into being a living community or fellowship of believing and converted people, not bound in perpetuity to any fixed institutions or to those of controlling meaning for the others. Or both sides may agree that the Church persists in continuity throughout history, but one side may find the guarantee of that continuity in an episcopate in Apostolic succession, and the other in the continuing witness of faith to faith, flame kindling flame across the centuries.

There was one formula which ran through the discussions of Section I at Amsterdam which went something like this. "Whenever we find an agreement we find disagreements within it. And whenever we state a disagreement we find new agreements within it." That is the shape of our ecumenical conversations by which we grow in mutual understanding and are led "deeper into the mystery of God's life and of ours."

The Amsterdam Report on "The Universal Church in God's Design" expresses some of the disagreements we found within our agreements. They can be read in the Report and need not be repeated here. Certainly many of them do not coincide with confessional lines or the divisions between the major communions or church families. As has

often been pointed out, they cut through our existing Churches and may therefore dwell together in one household so long as "we see through a glass darkly." Yet the continuing study of them by the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council may well help us to appreciate more fully the varieties of emphasis which may be transformed from barriers to sources of mutual enrichment.

The conclusion which I would draw from Amsterdam for the faith and order aspect of our common task is that it may be time for us to turn away for the immediate future from what might be called the fragmentizing approach, whereby we deal piece by piece with such items as creeds, sacraments, ministry, etc., and seek to understand better the total ways of apprehending the Church which shape so much of our thinking in our divided Churches.

II

When we turn back from the Amsterdam Assembly to the Lambeth Conference we move into a very different atmosphere. At Lambeth the bishops of the Anglican family of Churches were meeting for five weeks to consider together the inner life and problems of that communion, its mission to the world, and its relation with other Churches. The results of these discussions insofar as they could be caught in words are found in the Report entitled, "Lambeth Conference 1948." The fact that one third of this volume is devoted to the report of the Committee dealing with "Unity of the Church" reflects the place which this subject had in the five weeks of the Conference.

In line with the procedure of previous Lambeth Conferences the Reports carry the authority only of the committees by which they were prepared and presented, and the Conference as a whole is responsible only for the final Resolutions adopted. But the Report on Unity was presented by a very representative group of over sixty bishops and its most important recommendations were accepted in Resolutions adopted by the Conference as a whole.

Whereas Section I at Amsterdam was concerned only with the most general questions of the Church's nature and mission and did not deal specifically with any particular unions or schemes of union, Lambeth was directly confronted with a great variety of concrete issues directly involving constituent Churches of the Anglican Communion or the communion as a whole. These were of many kinds — a union actually consummated in South India, proposals for union in various stages of

development, proposals for the achievement of a mutually recognized ministry and other types of recognition or co-operation. All of the discussions gathered around these specific issues.

Clear priority was given to the Church in South India and to the question of the relation of the Anglican Communion to this new united Church. The conclusions reached are sufficiently given in the Resolutions. The most critical issue was that of the status of the Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons consecrated or ordained in the Church of South India at or after the inauguration of that Church. On that issue there was a frankly ackowledged division. A majority was prepared to accept them as truly Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons of the Church of Christ. A substantial minority was not ready as yet to pass any definite judgment. It was recognized that as a result divergent practical action would be taken in the Churches, Provinces or Dioceses, and the unanimous hope was recorded that such differences may never be made the ground for condemnation of one part of the Anglican Communion by another part. This is a typically Anglican solution of a difficult problem, according to which there is a brotherly agreement to differ and to seek to live out the resulting incongruities. The lay communicants of the new Church are to be accepted, and clerical or lay members of the Anglican Communion are to be subject to no censure if they accept work in or receive the ministrations of the Church of South India.

The second part of the Report on Unity deals with various approaches to non-Episcopal Churches looking towards corporate union or the achievement of a mutually recognized ministry. Detailed consideration is given to the schemes for union under discussion in Ceylon and North India, and the former is commended as likely to prove most satisfactory from the Anglican standpoint. Less full consideration is given to the Australian and Canadian conversations looking toward a mutually recognized ministry. It is evident that the Anglican mind continues to find the only ultimately satisfactory goal in organic or corporate union. But the conference was not prepared to discourage further exploration of proposals for the achievement of a mutually recognized ministry in advance of explicit plans for organic union, "if they are linked with provisions for the growing together of the Churches concerned and with a definite acceptance of organic union as the final goal."

The Lambeth Report makes it evident that a far reaching and disturbing issue of strategy was becoming explicit in the discussions. A

substantial section of the Anglican Communion has entered the South India Church and ceased to be a member of the Anglican Church family. If other schemes for reunion in the lands of the "Younger Churches" come to fruition that disintegration of the existing Anglican family of Churches will be carried further. The same holds, of course, for what at Amsterdam were called other world-wide confessional groupings.

Faced with this issue, the Bishops at Lambeth urged caution, on the one hand and, on the other hand, urged that the true goal is to be found in local unions of such a character that they can be in full communion with the Anglican Churches.

These counsels were gathered up in the second part of the Encyclical Letter sent out from Lambeth.

> Here we desire to set before our people a view of what, if it be the will of God, may come to pass. As Anglicans we believe that God has entrusted to us in our Communion not only the Catholic faith, but a special service to render to the whole Church. Reunion of any part of our Communion with other denominations in its own area must make the resulting Church no longer simply Anglican, but something more comprehensive. There would be, in every country where there now exists the Anglican Church and others separated from it, a united Church, Catholic and Evangelical, but no longer in the limiting sense of the word Anglican. The Anglican Communion would be merged in a much larger Communion of National or Regional Churches, in full communion with one another, united in all the terms of what is known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral.
>
> It is well to keep this vision before us; but we are still far from its attainment, and until this larger Communion begins to take firmer shape, it would be only a weakening of the present strength and service of the Anglican Communion if parts of it were severed from it prematurely. If we were slow to advance the larger cause, it would be a betrayal of what we believe to be our special calling. It would be equally a betrayal of our trust before God if the Anglican Communion were to allow itself to be dispersed before its particular work was done.
>
> In our Resolutions, we recommend that, in further schemes for reunion, care should be taken to see that they do not, unless for a brief time, put any member of our family of Churches out of communion with it and that they are not put into force unless after consultation with the rest of our family. That is a right and wise precaution. Yet we look to, and work for, the larger family, and we are thankful that in so many parts of the world other Churches are joined with us in working for it.

That is an expression of the Anglican dream for the "Great Church" to come and it is likely to shape Anglican approaches to unity in the years ahead.

THE WORSHIP SERVICES AT AMSTERDAM

By IVAN LEE HOLT

THERE seems to be no disagreement about the heart of any interdenominational and international religious gathering. It is not in the general discussions. It is not in the sectional meetings where reports are prepared. It is not in the study books which result from years of investigation and thought. It is not in the constitution nor in the policies proposed nor in the organization effected. The heart of any such gathering is the service of worship, where those of many denominations and many races seek the guidance of the one Holy Spirit and the blessing of the same Father in Heaven.

When one thinks of the Conference held at Oxford in 1937 one recalls how fellowship and understanding deepened with the worship services in St. Mary's Church. Men who had been arguing only a short time before, and men who differed in their points of view, repeated in their respective tongues the same prayers. At the close of the service of worship, no matter what form or rite was used, those present were closer together than they had been at any other time of the day. In my thinking the high moment in the Edinburgh Conference of the same summer was the closing service of worship in which Archbishop Temple urged us to forget our differences even though we might be grateful for the devotion and loyalties of our fathers to the things for which they stood. Then he led in a prayer that even those who respected the faith of the fathers should be led into new efforts to reconcile the differences between believing groups.

In the Worship Services at Amsterdam there was much of the same experience and spirit. The church in which the daily services were held was a typical Reformed Church. It was plain, with little decoration. The pulpit was very high, raising the speaker to the level of the balcony. There was little color in the windows. Everything was severely simple and there was not that atmosphere of reverence to which Gothic cathedrals with lovely windows accustom one. A leader of a service had to create an atmosphere through his attitudes and the form of service he selected. Each day there was a leader from a land and a denomination neither of which was represented in any other

service. From the United States a Methodist and a Quaker were chosen to lead. Those who arranged the program were anxious to include as many as possible of the forms of worship used in the member denominations.

The printing of the Orders of Worship was done in that dignified and fine style which has been developed through years of ecumenical meetings. There were three columns, English, French and German, the central column being the native language of the ministers who led the service. The hymnals used contained texts of the hymns in the same three languages. There was something very impressive about the singing of hymns in the three tongues and prayers repeated in the same languages. That in itself was a unifying influence whose importance can never be overlooked. Those who led the services were:

Rev. Michio Kozaki, the Kyodan Church of Japan
Bishop Ivan Lee Holt, the Methodist Church of the United States
Bishop Lajos Ordass, the Lutheran Church of Hungary
Rev. John A. Garrett, the Congregational Church of Australia
Rev. M. D. Ratefy, the Reformed Church of Madagascar
Dr. D. Elton Trueblood, the Religious Society of Friends of the United States
Mrs. John Karefa-Smart, the Methodist Church of West Africa
Rev. M. E. Aubrey, the Baptist Church of the United Kingdom
Bishop J. A. Jacob, the Church of South India.

At the close of each plenary session of the Assembly, and at the close of every committee and sectional meeting, there was a brief service of prayer. The form for that was arranged so that the service would have everywhere the same dignity.

The special services of the First Assembly were three in number — the Opening Service of Worship, the Service of Holy Communion and the Closing Service of Worship. The noble order for the Closing Service of Worship follows this article.

The Opening Service of Worship was arranged to include forms and rituals from many lands. Those who led the Service were:

Dr. K. H. E. Gravemeyer of Holland
The Archbishop of Canterbury
Pasteur Marc Boegner of France
The Archbishop of Upsala
The Archbishop of Thyateira
Dr. John R. Mott of the United States
Reverend D. T. Niles of India.

A formal processional or recessional characterized the Opening Service. The delegates were dressed in their ecclesiastical vestments and presented a spectacle of color and dignity as the procession moved down the aisles of the New Church. No such formality attended the Closing Service.

The Service of Holy Communion brought together representatives of all the churches except the Anglican, the Lutheran and the Orthodox Groups. Ministers of seven or eight different denominations and lands assisted the ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church, using the ritual of that church. After the prayers, hymns and meditation the officiating minister stood at the center of a long table covered with white cloths and seated with one hundred chairs, fifty on each side. At the invitation of the minister, and while the organ played, the communicants came forward and sat at the table. The bread and wine were blessed by the officiating minister and passed in both directions on each side of the table. Each person receiving the bread and wine passed them on to his neighbor. Then the table was dismissed with a quotation from the Seventeenth Chapter of John. There were eleven hundred communicants that morning, which meant the table was filled eleven times. It was a long service but it was probably the most impressive one of the Council Session.

To some visitors from America the Services seemed cold, but they had to be dignified and formal for such a meeting. To some they seemed to lack lifting power, but they were always heart-searching if not emotionally inspiring. It was evident that much care and thought were given to their preparation, and the Rev. Oliver Tomkins deserves as much or more credit than any other person for their beauty and impressiveness. Long after other memories of Amsterdam have faded will linger some experience in worship as men knelt together from the East and the West, the North and the South.

ORDER FOR THE CLOSING SERVICE OF WORSHIP

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
AMSTERDAM ASSEMBLY — 1948

Hymn

Scripture: I Peter, 1, vv. 3–13.

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

To an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you.

Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.

Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations:

That the trial of your faith, being much more precious than the gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ:

Whom having not seen, ye love: in whom though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory:

Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls. Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.

Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into.

Therefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ.

Singing of a Psalm by the Orthodox Choir

Prayer:

We give thanks to Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, that we are one in our Lord Jesus Christ; not by the agreement of our minds or the consent of our wills, but by that which He, in His unmerited Grace, has done for us in His incarnation, death and resurrection, and by the gift of the Holy Spirit.

We thank Thee, O God.

We give thanks that He has called us into His faith, and laid upon us an allegiance to Himself that is above all other loyalties.

We thank Thee, O God.

We give thanks for the knowledge that though we are divided in outward form we all are the objects of the love and grace of God.

We thank Thee, O God.

We give thanks that we have been brought into a fellowship of thought and prayer; for all that we have learned in our fellowship; for prejudices overcome; misunderstandings removed, sympathies enlarged, insight deepened; and for all advance that has been made towards a common mind.

We thank Thee, O God.

We give thanks for the joy that we have found in sharing the treasures of worship and devotion that we even now hold in common.

We thank Thee, O God.

We acknowledge that our understandings of the truth as it is in Jesus has been limited by our pride, wilfulness and narrowness of mind, and that our witness to the world is weakened by our divisions.

Lord, have mercy upon us.

We pray that through patience and humility Christians of each several communions may be led to a deeper understanding of those truths of the Gospel to which they have borne witness; into a wider understanding of those truths for which other communions have stood; and finally into an apprehension of the truth in its fulness, wherein all our partial apprehension shall be brought into unity.

Lord, hear our prayer.

We therefore pray together to Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, that He will forgive the sinfulness of our separation, and grant us true repentance and grace to amend our ways.

Lord, hear our prayer.

We pray that Christians everywhere may be led to seek diligently for ways of manifesting in outward and visible form the unity of heart and spirit which has been granted to us.

Lord, hear our prayer.

We pray that all men everywhere, in a world distracted and divided, may turn to Christ, who makes us one in spite of our divisions; that He may bind in one those whom many worldly claims set at variance; and that the world may find peace and unity in Him; to Whom be glory for ever.

Let us pray for the Peace of the World:

Almighty God, from whom all thoughts of truth and peace proceed: Kindle,

we pray Thee, in the hearts of all men the true love of peace; and guide with Thy pure and peaceable wisdom those who take counsel for the nations of the earth; that in tranquillity Thy kingdom may go forward, till the earth is filled with the knowledge of Thy love; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

The Lord's Prayer

Our Father, which art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done; In earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation; But deliver us from evil. *Amen.*

Hymn

Address in French

Hymn

Address in German

Hymn

Address in English

Te Deum:

We praise Thee, O God; we acknowledge Thee to be the Lord. All the earth doth worship Thee: the Father everlasting.
To Thee all Angels cry aloud: the Heavens, and all the Powers therein.
To Thee Cherubin, and Seraphim: continually do cry,
Holy, Holy, Holy: Lord God of Sabaoth;
Heaven and Earth are full: of the Majesty of thy glory.
The glorious company of the Apostles: praise Thee;
The goodly fellowship of the Prophets: praise Thee;
The noble army of Martyrs: praise Thee;
The holy Church throughout all the world: doth acknowledge Thee;
The Father: of an infinite Majesty;
Thine honourable, true: and only Son;
Also the Holy Ghost: the Comforter.
Thou art the King of Glory: O Christ.
Thou art the everlasting Son: of the Father.
When Thou tookest upon Thee to deliver man: Thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb.
When Thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death: Thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers.
Thou sittest at the right hand of God: in the Glory of the Father.
We believe that Thou shalt come: to be our Judge.
We therefore pray Thee, help Thy servants: whom Thou hast redeemed with Thy precious blood.

Make them to be numbered with Thy Saints: in glory everlasting.
O Lord, save Thy people: and bless Thine heritage.
Govern them: and lift them up for ever.
Day by day: we magnify Thee;
And we worship Thy name: ever world without end.
Vouchsafe, O Lord: to keep us this day without sin.
O Lord, have mercy upon us; have mercy upon us.
O Lord, let Thy mercy lighten upon us: as our trust is in Thee.
O Lord, in Thee have I trusted: let me never be confounded.

Closing Collect:

O Christ, our only Saviour, so dwell within us that we may go forth with the light of hope in our eyes, and the fire of inspiration on our lips, Thy word on our tongues, and Thy love in our hearts. *Amen.*

Benediction:

The Lord bless thee and keep thee;
The Lord make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee;
The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.

THE ASSEMBLY AND PRACTICAL ISSUES

By G. BROMLEY OXNAM

THE editor has requested an article on how the Assembly of the World Council of Churches acted upon the practical issues before it. What are "practical issues"? Was Jesus "practical" when he summoned fishermen and a tax collector from their means of livelihood? Did he lose himself in "the futility of the distant ideal" when he called upon men to walk a second mile, to give a cloak, and to take no thought for the morrow? How "practical" was he when he set His face toward Jerusalem, answered "Thou hast said" to a Roman governor, and finally prayed, "Father, forgive them"?

The most "practical" fact of Amsterdam was the spirit present in the Assembly. Karl Barth was right when he said, "We have our differences, but they are within our agreements." The differences were stated clearly and forcefully, and they were heard critically but cordially. The identities were expressed in the Section Reports which were considered in the Assembly. These Reports, after fair weighing and action upon amendments, were voted with surprising unanimity. There was no attempt to coerce the body into statements carried by a majority of one. The larger synthesis was sought and happily found. These Reports were "received and commended" to the Churches. The Message was adopted. All this was possible because of the spirit present. It was the spirit that flows from experience of Christ's transforming love.

Amsterdam declared and demonstrated that the differences that lie in doctrinal statement and ecclesiastical practice are subordinate to and of lesser significance than the identities that lie in a common faith in Jesus Christ as God incarnate and Saviour.

Amsterdam proved that men and women of many races and of many nations can worship, witness, and work together. True unity will emerge from such common experiences.

Amsterdam established an organization through which Christians of the world may study, serve, speak and stand together.

Amsterdam recognized that within denominational differences precious truth is present, and that in the mutual sharing of spiritual possessions all become richer and none poorer. A least common de-

nominator, immediate *union,* would be of less value to the eventual union of the Churches than the present preservation of the creative contributions of each denomination in the greatest common denominator, *unity,* now possible. There can be *union* without *unity,* and *unity* without *union.* It would appear that the road that leads to the churches becoming the Church is by way of the reunion of confessional families first. Then may come the reuniting of related confessions, and some day, please God, the Holy Catholic Church in which there is *unity* within *union.*

Amsterdam proved that intellectually honest men and women can pursue truth together in mutual respect, rejecting at once all attempts to coerce in the name of conformity or to control in the name of hierarchical authority. Within the conditions of freedom, relying upon democratic processes and rejecting any thought of super-church or ecclesiastical totalitarianism, Amsterdam established a World Council of Churches. The basic unit is the individual Church, free to express its convictions and to preserve its forms but bound by the law of love as revealed in Christ.

Amsterdam faced the baffling issues of international order and of economic and social organization realistically, and insisted that the Church is obligated to give itself to those endeavors through which the moral law may come alive in the practices of the group life. All social systems are to be judged by the ethical ideals of the faith. Christians refuse to identify the Gospel with any economic theory or order.

Amsterdam created friendship and understandings, and in the hearts and minds of delegates are to be found the love and respect upon which the structure of the future will be reared.

Amsterdam may take its place among the great dates of Christian history. Its place will be determined by the future. At present, the chief word concerning the World Council of Churches is found in the simple statement: *It is!*

I

It is! Pastor Marc Boegner, on behalf of the Committee of Fourteen and the Provisional Committee, read the following Resolution to the Assembly on Monday morning, August 23rd, 1948:

That the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches be declared to be and is hereby constituted, in accordance with the Constitution drafted at Utrecht in 1938 and approved by the Churches; that the Assembly consist of those per-

sons who have been appointed as the official delegates of the Churches adhering to the Council; and that the formation of the World Council of Churches be declared to be and hereby is completed.

The motion was put, and was carried unanimously. Certain necessary amendments were later adopted without dissenting vote. Thus, the practical question of setting up an organization and of reaching agreement upon the basis of fellowship was faced and answer found.

The basis is a clear-cut affirmation: "The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of Churches which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour." It is a Council of Churches, and the Churches in fellowship will seek "to facilitate common action . . . promote cooperation in study . . . promote the growth of ecumenical consciousness . . . establish relations with denominational federations of world-wide scope and with other ecumenical movements . . . call world conferences on specific subjects as occasion may require . . . and to support the Churches in their task of evangelism."

Practically speaking, the organizational set-up is, as follows: first, *The Assembly,* composed of delegates chosen by the Churches, to meet ordinarily once every five years, the principal authority of the World Council; second, *The Central Committee,* composed of the Presidents and not more than ninety members chosen by the Assembly from its members, to meet not less than once a year, the governing body of the World Council between sessions of the Assembly; third, *The Executive Committee,* to be composed of the President, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee, and twelve other persons, to meet ordinarily twice a year.

The Assembly, Central, and Executive Committees constitute the policy-forming and governing bodies of the World Council. The Assembly recognized that the Churches must take the policy-forming task seriously, if the danger of bureaucratic control is to be avoided. The General Secretary has given this question serious thought, and in the basic volume, *Documents of the World Council of Churches* which he had submitted to the Assembly had asked, "How can we secure an adequate and competent secretariat without building up a bureaucratic machinery which instead of serving churches might become an aim in itself?" The Assembly, therefore, voted: (a) That the Central Committee meet at least once a year and for a long enough period to maintain adequate supervision of the work of the Council, and to assure that decisions of policy shall be taken by the Central Committee,

which as a policy-forming body is representative of the churches themselves; and (b) that the Executive Committee meet two or three times each year in order to deal with current business, because "unless a responsible governing body of the Council meets once every four or six months, the departmental committees and the General Secretariat are practically forced to take decisions which ought normally to be taken by one of the governing bodies of the Council." The Assembly rejected the suggestion that members of the Executive Committee might choose substitutes from persons resident in or near Geneva to represent them when unable to attend, and voted that such alternates must be chosen by the Churches, thus again stressing the necessity of keeping decisions of policy in the hands of the church.

The administrative and functional organization was established, as follows: First, the General Secretariat, composed of the General Secretary and five Associate General Secretaries, is the administrative staff of the Council. The Associates are charged with functional responsibilities, namely, (a) Reconstruction and Inter-church Aid, together with general supervision of Youth Work; (b) Study and Evangelism; (c) International Relations; (d) Faith and Order; and (e) Promotion. Second, the Departments, with appropriate governing commissions or committees, all responsible to the Central Committee and the Assembly: (a) Faith and Order; (b) Study; (c) Reconstruction and Interchurch Aid, including Refugee Division; (d) Youth; (e) Ecumenical Institute; (f) International Affairs, in conjunction with the International Missionary Council; (g) Finance and Business; (h) Prisoners of War; (i) Promotion and Publicity, to include interest in the Ecumenical Press Service. A Commission on Women's Work in the Church was established, and the appointment of a Secretary for Evangelism authorized.

The Secretary for Faith and Order will be located in London, and he will also be responsible for the work heretofore done by the London Office. The Secretary for Promotion, together with an Assistant Secretary of Program, will be located in New York, and will carry the work heretofore done in the New York office by the American Committee for the World Council of Churches.

Charters were adopted governing the Reconstruction and Interchurch Aid Department, the Youth Department, the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, and the Faith and Order Department.

It will be seen that a thoroughgoing piece of work was done in building the organizational structure of the Council.

A budget was adopted for the year 1949, totaling $539,660. Of this amount, $176,660 is to cover the administrative and service costs of the Department of Reconstruction (including a small sum of $1,200 to conclude the work of the Prisoners of War Commission) and will be provided by the great agencies of the giving countries, such as Church World Service, Inc., in the United States. The Rockefeller gift for the support of The Ecumenical Institute will provide $60,000 during 1949; and $3,000 in special gifts to complete the study of "The Life and Work of Women in the Church" are anticipated. This leaves $300,000 to be provided by the member Churches of the World Council. Each Church was called upon to make a contribution, and the Assembly requested the Churches to present the needs of the World Council to all their congregations on some appropriate Sunday and to receive an offering. With world financial conditions as they are, 80 per cent, or $240,000, must be contributed by the churches of the United States in 1949. It is hoped that by 1950 churches outside the United States may contribute 25 per cent of the total and move progressively to an equitable share as conditions become normal.

Thus, the organization has been created. It must find its life in its service. The Assembly said:

> The program of the World Council of Churches must be not only service in the name of the Churches but also service to the Churches. The purposes of the Council will come alive on a world scale only as the creative contribution of the Council, in a decentralized plan of service, is carried by the Churches themselves to their own members, constituents, and areas of responsibility.

If two hundred representatives of the press had attended the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and had reported the lengthy debates, the necessary reconciliation of differing views, and, because the reader enjoys a fight, had lifted relatively unimportant expressions of opinion into headlines and lead articles, it is doubtful whether the general reader would have realized that a Republic had been established, a nation born. So, too, at Amsterdam, newspapers saw drama in the differing approaches of John Foster Dulles and Joseph Hromadka to the communist issue, and regrettably left out much of the extraordinarily constructive contributions of each address, as well as the fact that each man grounded his thought in the teaching of Jesus and called for obedience to the moral principles that Christianity espouses. Am-

sterdam is a beginning, but a great beginning. Its constitution has been adopted. A world organization has been established. A century hence, men may see more clearly the historic significance of what was done in the "practical" realm at Amsterdam.

II

Amsterdam faced not only the "practical" problem of organization, but the "practical" question of how one hundred forty-seven churches might speak in one voice. Real issues could have been avoided, and nicely worded resolutions, full of platitudes and unrelated to contemporary issues, could have been drafted. The easy way was rejected. The Study Department, under Henry Pitney Van Dusen's brilliant leadership, came to grips with the toughest issues, such as "The Universal Church in God's Design," with a frank presentation in the very first chapter of the first volume, of differing interpretations of "The Doctrine of the Church: The Church's Witness to God's Design," asking, "Why, seeing that the Gospel is the good news of God to all men, is the proclamation of the message by the Church so largely ineffective in producing the results the Church is aiming at?" Similarly realistic were the treatments of "The Church and the Disorder of Society," with its head-on collision with the facts of technics, science, power, communism, fascism, capitalism; and of "The Church and the International Disorder," with such a question as that of Christian responsibility in a world of power.

It was in the sectional discussions that the Christian spirit was compellingly present to insure constructive and therefore "practical" utterances. It took not a little Christian grace to tolerate a few who spoke too often and too long and seemed to suggest that all the culture and all the real understanding of problems resided in the restricted area from which they came. There are some assumptions of "scholarship" that are almost insufferable, when closer contact with the "scholar" reveals that he is unacquainted with the research and thought of areas outside his insularity. Such inner irritation was seldom outwardly evident, and the proper response to provincialism was at least an attempt to reveal the universalism of the Gospel, and an endeavor to grasp its spirit. In any case, the sectional reports were in the main in advance of ecumenical statements heretofore commended to the Churches, and reveal that co-operative thinking in Christian spirit at the world level is possible and precious, — in a word, "practical."

Humility is of practical worth. The Reports reflect the humble and contrite heart. The Assembly declared:

We come from Christian Churches which have for long misunderstood, ignored and misrepresented one another; we come from lands which have often been in strife; we are sinful men and we are heirs to the sins of our fathers.

We believe that the Church is God's gift to men for the salvation of the world; that the saving acts of God in Jesus Christ brought the Church into being; that the Church persists in continuity throughout history through the presence and power of the Holy Spirit.

Receiving the Report of Section II on "The Witness of the Church to God's Design," the Assembly asked:

What does the world see, or think it sees, when it looks at the Church? It is a Church divided, hesitant, and too often complacent. It is a Church that has largely lost touch with the dominant realities of modern life, and still tries to meet the modern world with language and a technique that may have been appropriate two hundred years ago. It is a Church that, by its failure to speak effectively on the subject of war, has appeared impotent to deal with the realities of the human situation. It is a Church accused by many of having been blind to the movement of God in history, of having sided with the vested interests of society and state, and of having failed to kindle the vision that would purify the wills of men in a changing world. It is a Church under suspicion in many quarters of having used its missionary enterprise to further the foreign policies of states and the imperialistic designs of the powers of the West.

But the spirit of contrition did not blind the Assembly to the opportunities and obligations of the hour. It said:

It is a Church that, in this Assembly for the first time, treats evangelism as the common task of all the Churches, and transcends the traditional distinction between the so-called Christian and so-called non-Christian lands. It is a Church awakening to its great opportunity to become all things to all men, and to enter redemptively into this world with which God has confronted us. The present day is the beginning of a new epoch of missionary enterprise, calling for the pioneering spirit and for the dedication of many lives to the service of the Gospel of God.

The Assembly recognized that "the fulfillment of this duty involves a revolution in thought and practice." Has any ecumenical Assembly ever been more practical than this, when it declared:

It is essential that each group (referring to the Churches) become a real fellowship, through acceptance by all of full Christian responsibility for mutual service, and by breaking down the barriers of race and class. It is intolerable that

anyone should be excluded because of his race or color from any Christian place of worship. . . . The Church must find its way to the places where men really live. It must penetrate the alienated world from within. . . .

"New ventures of self-identification by Christians with the life of that world, partly by Christians making the word of the Gospel heard in places where decisions are made that affect the lives of men" are essential. The Church must "see the purpose of God working in the events, movements, and revolutions of the present age, and again (must) speak to the nations the word of God with authority."

Throughout all of the Report, the Assembly faced what it called "a scandal within the body of Christ." This was a reference to segregation. "Even where there are no differences of theology, or language, or liturgy, there exist Churches segregated by race and color. . . ." There were many who felt the theological emphasis was too strong at Amsterdam. Apparently they missed the "practical" evangelistic pronouncements which were prophetic. "The whole Church should set itself to the total task of winning the whole world for Christ. . . . For most people the field of witness lies in the place where they do their daily work." "To the Church, then, is given the privilege of so making Christ known to men that each is confronted with the necessity of personal answer, Yes or No."

With similar forthrightness, the Assembly considered the difficult question of unity. It said, "God wills the unity of His Church, and we must be obedient to Him. . . . Although genuine convictions and loyalty to truth itself have their part in the making and perpetuating of divisions, we confess that pride, self-will, and lovelessness have also played their part and still do. . . ."

The Assembly moved up to the highly controversial question of the Lord's Supper. It said, "The ecumenical movement loses significance, unless all its constituent Churches bear ceaselessly in mind the prayer of Christ 'that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me' and are prepared to move forward, as God guides them, to the further unity in faith, in fellowship, at the table of the Lord, and in united proclamation of the word of life."

Practically, this statement is of major significance. There was no "official" service of Holy Communion. There was the never-to-be-forgotten service in the Nieuw Kirk, according to the rite of the Dutch Reformed Church, to which all were invited. There were, in addition,

services according to the Anglican and the Orthodox rites, and perhaps others. A service according to the Methodist Ritual, and in keeping with its spirit of welcoming all who desire to lead a new life in Christ Jesus, was canceled lest it contribute to the sad divisiveness at the Table of the Lord. What a strange commentary upon our Christian faith is the fact of exclusiveness at the Lord's Table. Some attending the Dutch service refrained from accepting the elements from their brothers' hands. Still others absented themselves. Thus the statement summoning us to move to "further unity" at "the table of the Lord" is significant, both as an admission of sin and as a resolve to repent.

The Report dealing with the Disorder of Society and the whole issue of international affairs will be regarded with increasing respect as the years pass.

"There is no inescapable necessity for society to succumb to undirected developments of technology, and the Christian Church has an urgent responsibility today to help men to achieve fuller personal life within the technical society." It was noted that the great aggregations of power make it increasingly difficult for persons to act as moral and accountable beings.

> Our churches have often given religious sanctions to the special privileges of dominant classes, races, and political groups, and so they have been obstacles to changes necessary in the interests of social justice and political freedom. . . . There are economic necessities which no political system can afford to defy. . . . Justice, however, demands that economic activities be subordinated to social ends. It is intolerable that vast millions of people be exposed to insecurity, hunger, and frustration by periodic inflation or depression. . . . We must vindicate the supremacy of persons over purely technical considerations by subordinating all economic processes and cherished rights to the needs of the community as a whole . . . escape the perils of tyranny while avoiding the dangers of anarchy.

The much discussed section on communism and capitalism should be read in its entirety and in relation to the whole emphasis upon freedom and the rights of the individual. Commentators take a condensed and partial news cable, consider it out of context, and then, with no real understanding of what has been said, proceed to comment, with the result that the public is hopelessly confused and unhappily misinformed. The World Council faces the practical problem of conveying its pronouncements to the people. Mr. Charles P. Taft's extraordinary contributions in organizing the press service places the churches and the people in great debt to him, and his insistence that a competent

Department of Publicity and Public Relations be established was a practical proposal of significance. European church leaders, unacquainted with the values of proper public relations, tend to discount the necessity and thus get a "bad press," not realizing that the creation of an atmosphere congenial to the reception of the Christian message is of first importance.

The Section dealing with International Relations spoke with the knowledge that the World Council is equipped "practically" to carry pronouncements into practice through the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs. "War, being a consequence of the disregard of God, is not inevitable if man will turn to Him in repentance and obey His law." "War as a method of settling disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ." Repudiating all forms of totalitarianism, the Report summoned the churches to discover a way in which competing systems such as "communism, socialism, and free enterprise may co-exist without leading to war." Perhaps the most significant practical contribution has been the work in connection with the Bill of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, with particular emphases on religious liberty.

III

Some practical matters, perhaps of lesser detail, were not solved at Amsterdam. The European acceptance of queueing appears to justify congestion and hours of wasted time. For instance, some of the mail boxes were located in a room reached by a narrow hall, with book stall and newspaper counters on either side. Delegates had to push their way through. The mailbox room was also the room where currency was exchanged, telegrams sent, train tickets booked, and even the inevitable coffee was served. But these boxes, hard enough to reach, did not carry the material for the delegates, such as transcripts of addresses and documents. These were supposed to be handed out at the Assembly, but not being available at each door, many delegates missed much essential material. The undistributed material at first was placed on tables in the hall, and promptly taken by "official" unofficial visitors and others, in quantity to be mailed home. A little planning would have made all of the material available in the individual mail box. It was said, "But how could we know whether to put an English, French, or German copy in the mail box?" Answer — a simple colored tab, white for English, blue for French, and red for German pasted on the mail box.

Again, the use of binders, with the material properly punched, would have helped.

Another practical matter has to do with parliamentary procedure. European procedures give a chairman almost autocratic power, and make it possible to have several proposals under consideration at one time, and the custom of sending up cards when a delegate desires to speak means that, unless an usher is immediately at hand, the card is slow in reaching the platform, and the opportunity to speak at the precise moment the issue is up is often lost. The individual does not know his rights. All of this needs to be worked out for future Assembly sessions.

Practically, Amsterdam missed out in not dramatizing its high moments. True enough, the opening service had much of pageantry, and the old church lent itself admirably to the occasion; but other significant hours were treated with a casualness that was cold and regrettable. For instance, when the constitution was adopted, surely we might have risen to sing the Doxology. There was no installation service recognizing the presidents elected by the Council to lead for the coming five years. A beautiful service might well have been planned for this occasion, properly photographed, and sent to the far corners of the earth. It was not a question of personal recognition for individuals involved, but rather the dramatizing of one of the significant acts of the Assembly, so that the people of the Churches the world round might have been made aware that the World Council is in being, and therefore come to its support in service and gifts. We have much to learn from the Roman Catholic Church in such matters. Worldly pomp and pageantry can be avoided, but such opportunities can in proper simplicity and democratic spirit be used to the glory of God.

IV

Practical plans for the policy-forming bodies of the Council have been made. The Central Committee will meet once each year, in 1949 in England, in 1950 in Canada, in 1951 in Scandinavia (if the World Conference on Faith and Order is held that year in Europe), in 1952 in Asia, and in 1953, in conjunction with the next Assembly, in the United States. The Executive Committee will meet at least twice a year, the next meeting to be in Geneva in February, 1949.

Thus from the "practical" point of view, the organization was established, necessary officers chosen, a staff appointed, provision made for

budget; with all policy-forming bodies directly representative of the Churches which constitute the Council. In addition, the Council thus established spoke with constructive courage and in Christian spirit. Practical problems were faced and solved. The highest credit must go to the General Secretary and his staff, his advisers and the Provisional Committee for the deep thought, the skillful planning, and the Christian spirit developed.

DEVELOPMENT OF THOUGHT ABOUT THE CHURCH

By CLARENCE T. CRAIG

THE Amsterdam Section dealing with The Universal Church in God's Design faced problems which were on the one hand specifically theological; on the other hand it was concerned with the practical relations to each other of the bodies which were forming the World Council of Churches. It is safe to say that in America the issues faced by this Commission had attracted less attention than any of the others. The doctrine of the Church had not appeared as the most absorbing theme to be grappled with in the year 1948. At Amsterdam, however, it proved otherwise. There, the fundamental importance of these issues was inescapable.

The preparatory volume on this topic is one of the most logically organized in the series. It opens with five contrasting essays on the Biblical doctrine of the Church. This is followed by a section describing the glory of the Church's witness in our time, but at the same time portraying her shame in contamination by the world. The last part deals with selected problems of the ecumenical movement. These essays were not subjected to minute discussion at Amsterdam, but provided rather the background for a consideration of these themes.

I

It was anticipated that if a fruitful statement was to be made in this difficult realm by the Assembly, preparation must begin long in advance. At the last meeting of the editorial committee, held in Geneva in January, the vice-chairman of the Commission was asked to prepare a preliminary draft of a Report which might aid in focussing the issues. Until the Section was ready to produce its own draft, this preliminary document and a revised formulation provided the starting point for the discussion.

This procedure originated at the pre-Assembly meeting of the Commissions which was held at Woudschoten, the student Conference center in the Netherlands, August 18–20th. The officers of the Commission had expected to hold back this preliminary draft so that there

might be the freest possible interchange of ideas. But it became apparent at once that the twenty-four members of the Commission present felt that they could come to grips with the fundamental issues better by discussing a 2000 word statement rather than a 200 page book.

At Woudschoten the leadership of the Section met in intimate fellowship and established the basis for understanding which made the success of the Section possible. There were many colorful personalities — Karl Barth, who amazed all by his eagerness to appreciate sympathetically the most contrary positions; Michael Ramsay, the leader of the Anglo-Catholic party in Great Britain, who had so much to do with the pamphlet *Catholicity;* Father Florowsky, the chief mouthpiece for the Orthodox churches and who this year comes to teach in America; V. E. Devadutt, a most effective voice for the younger churches which are most insistent upon the necessity of union; Edmund Schlink, the most forceful and incisive German Lutheran theologian of our day; Bishop Y. T. Brilioth of Sweden, one of the vice-presidents of the Faith and Order Movement; and Bishop Hans Lilje. He had been selected by the Committee on Arrangements as chairman of the Section, despite the fact that he had had no previous experience on this Commission. He vindicated their confidence by his winsome tact and firm grasp of the fundamental issues.

The preliminary draft statement opened with the affirmation of seven agreements about the Church: her divine origin, the centrality of Christ in her redemption, the marks of the Church, the life and vocation of the Church, her two-fold relationship, her ministry, and her essential unity. This was followed by reference to the fact that despite these seven agreements basic disagreements remained which must be explored by the Faith and Order Commission. It had been the hope that the Section would be willing to lift up unequivocably the things which unite us at the time of the formation of the World Council of Churches. It was soon apparent, however, that some of the most forceful members of the group were not ready to do this without at the same time elaborating the things which divide and giving to them equal prominence. They were afraid of producing a statement which would affirm a unity which is not supported by the actual situation. The same affirmations did not in fact mean the same thing to all who joined in them. The dialectical theologian, Karl Barth, proposed the application of a dialectical method in the study of the problem. Within our agreements we should seek to isolate our disagreements; then, in

turn, within our most difficult disagreements seek the underlying agreement which is still there. Over and over again when a speaker would try his hardest to describe the special emphasis of his Church, those who came from very divergent traditions would reply, "But we believe that too." In the end, the Commission perfected the wording of the seven agreements and added under each of them the points of disagreement within that particular area.

Less time was spent in restating possible declarations dealing with the themes of the other two parts of the volume. They were revised in the form of a statement of the problems rather than of possible resolutions regarding them because there was not time to reach a common mind. The same difficulty arose at Amsterdam. The discussion of the doctrine of the Church proved so absorbing that the problems of the ecumenical movement received insufficient attention.

The full Section was widely representative of the churches. As vice-chairmen there were chosen Bishop Michio Kozaki of Japan, Bishop Panteleimon of Ednessa in Greece, and Professor Donald Baillie of Scotland, whose recent book, *God was in Christ,* reveals the fine quality of his mind. Distinguished veterans of the Faith and Order Movement were in its membership, Canon Leonard Hodgson (Anglican), its theological secretary, R. Newton Flew (Methodist), chairman of its Commission on the Church, and William Robinson (Disciples, Great Britain) who had recently published a book on *The Church and the New Testament.* Dr. Anders Nygren of Sweden brought another influential Lutheran voice, and there were several French-speaking Reformed theologians of distinction. From America, Bishop Angus Dun of Washington, W. E. Garrison of Chicago, E. T. Dahlberg (Baptist), F. C. Fry and A. R. Wentz (both Lutherans) were among those who took part in the discussion.

The Section included delegates from Iceland to Australia, from Central Africa to Norway, and from the Korean Church to the Mar Thoma Syrian Church of Malabar. Provision for translation had to be made without the use of the ear-phones which saved so much time in the plenary sessions. Those who spoke French received running interpretation in one corner and those requiring German in another. German and French speeches were translated to the English-speaking majority by a very effective interpreter. The Bishop of Abyssinia required his own personal interpreter, through whom he gave his one speech to the Section.

On the whole, the discussion in the Section was excellent — far more important than that in the plenary session. Naturally there were delegates who had brought prepared speeches on subjects which particularly interested them. The claim that a point was not "sufficiently stressed" sometimes became less an occasion for changing the wording than for giving the man a chance to make a speech on his pet theme. So will it always be in Assembly discussions! About sixty different delegates and consultants took the floor at least once, yet the decisive words were usually spoken by one or another of the leaders.

A few epigrammatic expressions stand out in the minds of many delegates. Bishop A. B. Akinyele of Nigeria, Africa, was most refreshing in his broad churchmanship. Early he affirmed, "Where there is the love of God, there is Jesus Christ, and where he is, there is the Church." On one of the last days he told the story of John Wesley's dream. The founder of Methodism dreamed that he went to hell, and there he found representatives of all the leading denominations. When he was taken to heaven, he asked for Methodists, Anglicans, Baptists, and the rest, but was assured that there were none there. "Who is in heaven?" Wesley asked. The reply came, "Only humble followers of the Lord Jesus Christ." William Robinson, who served as liaison with the press, found an answering echo in the hearts of many when he affirmed, "We have come here that all of our churches may die — not die out, but die."

As the Section came to grips with the list of agreements and disagreements, it became increasingly apparent that a perilous course lay ahead. It was difficult for some of the delegates to realize that no attempt was being made to formulate a complete doctrine of the Church. Individual delegates wanted to go beyond the statement of agreements. But that could not be done unless the additions were likewise convictions of all the others. A more basic difficulty lay in the fears of the Anglo-Catholic, Old Catholic, and Orthodox representatives that the list of seven agreements would leave the impression that they really did see eye to eye with the free-churchmen. When the Drafting Committee took up this part of the statement on Friday afternoon the outlook was very dark indeed. For a time it seemed impossible to find a solution. "Coffee" periods were sometimes an awkward intrusion into the discussions, but on this occasion the intermission provided an interval to work out a basis to save the Report. It was proposed that after a short affirmation concerning the miracle that God had brought us

together at Amsterdam, there should be a statement concerning the fundamental line of cleavage which gave the agreements which should follow a totally different setting for different groups of delegates. Then we could affirm our agreements and refer our disagreements to the Faith and Order Commission. This pattern became the basis for the drafts which were prepared by Oliver Tomkins, the efficient secretary of the Section. He preferred, however, and secured the adoption of a reduction to two basic agreements, a combination of the first three to express the nature of the church, and of the next three on the function of the Church. The seventh, dealing with the unity of the Church, was the theme of this entire section of the Report.

This solution produced in turn an equally difficult problem. How was this total difference between the Anglo-Catholic, Old Catholic and Orthodox and the other groups to be stated fairly and intelligibly in a few sentences? In the Drafting Committee, in the Section, and in plenary session this difficulty had to be faced anew. In the plenary session an amendment was proposed which threatened to overthrow the whole basis which had made the Report possible. It was proposed that a "middle way" between what was described as "Protestant" and "Catholic" be set forth. If adopted, that would have obliterated the whole idea of the "deepest difference" and would have made it impossible to have a report which was unanimously accepted. Fortunately the amendment was rejected by a comfortable margin.

As a matter of fact, there was no "middle way" at this point. The whole series of agreements affirmed the philosophy of the Church which is held by the advocates of this amendment. There *is* a third general position, but one of the most significant aspects of Amsterdam lay in the fact that this point of view was never advocated by any one, either in the Section or in the plenary session. This view is the conception of the Church which was dominant in many Protestant circles up to twenty-five years ago, that churches were formed by Christian believers in imitation of Greek religious societies and the Jewish synagogue organizations. At Amsterdam the only conception advocated was that of the Church as a People of God's creation whom he has called and gathered.

II

At Woudschoten, members of the Commission I were interested in elaborating the conception of repentance in the Church. At Amster-

dam the focus of attention in the second part of the Report was on the word "shame." Archbishop J. A. F. Gregg of Ireland combatted the idea that there was "shame" associated with the eternal Church of God. H. A. Hodges replied that Christ had taken his bride in the shame of her sin and lifted her to her present status. Ralph Sockman suggested that we might avoid the difficulty by extending the title of this section to "The Glory of the Church and the Shame of the Churches." This was done.

No great difficulty was found in enumerating the occasions for repentance. It was only an "observer" from South Africa who rose to ask if they really meant to call segregation on the basis of race and color a "scandal within the Body of Christ." He was frank in saying that his Church did not so consider it. More opposition was expressed to the phrase, "domination by ecclesiastic officialdom." There were ecclesiastical officials present who did not think they deserved this criticism, but Barth successfully pleaded for its retention.

The expressions of gratitude caused more difficulty. The South India union proved to be a bone of contention, as had been the case at the Lambeth Conference. The Indians wanted it specifically mentioned; others felt that it was unwise to refer to a single illustration. The large majority desired to thank God for the result in South India, but there was a vocal minority who were not thankful for a union which seemed to them basically defective in preserving the *esse* of the Church. Through the forceful protest of D. T. Niles the original statement was greatly improved in the plenary session, but it still fell short of what the majority would like to have said.

III

The third part of the Report kept shrinking in size. There was no time left to discuss adequately the problem of the conflict of regional and confessional loyalties. Since it was impossible to state conclusions which truly represented the mind of the Section, the problem was only referred to. It was clear that during the ten years since Edinburgh there had been a marked growth of neo-confessionalism as well as of the ecumenical movement. Donald Baillie was most frank in calling attention to the fact that this made it exceedingly difficult to go beyond Edinburgh in important regards. Since the whole problem of proselytism among member churches of the Council was receiving some attention in Section II, Section I let this "hot potato" drop. It had become

clear at Woudschoten that diametrically opposite views were held about the absence of the Church of Rome. It seemed best to leave the subject with the wisely worded paragraph in the General Secretary's report. It also seemed unwise to try to include any further reference to the absence of Orthodox bodies under communist domination, or of the fundamentalist groups which had held a rival meeting the week preceding. Authoritative copies of the statement of the Moscow Patriarchate were not available, and misrepresentation of its position would have been deplorable.

The most active debate on this part of the Report concerned the question whether the name, "World Council of Churches," implied a situation that ought not to be. A majority wanted to say that to refer to denominations as "churches" involves a terminology which finds no support in the New Testament. There we read of local congregations and the one Church of Christ. But it was found to be very difficult to say this in a way that would not be misunderstood, especially by certain Baptists and Lutherans. In his presentation of the Report at the plenary session, Bishop Lilje read the sentences which many would have included, but it was felt wiser not to try to make them part of the official document.

The discussion in the plenary session led to a few modifications in the text. It was more clearly stated that there are many types of difference as well as "our deepest difference." The terms, "Catholic" and "Protestant" were further clarified to avoid misunderstanding in certain parts of the world. The desire of Archbishop Germanos to have the eternal character of the Church given more place was met by the addition of a phrase. Care was taken that the idea of continuity within the Church should be stated more explicitly. "Race discrimination" was taken out of a list of sins of the churches and given separate repudiation. And as we have already noted, the gratitude for achievements in church union was made more clear-cut. But the substance of the Report was welcomed with appreciatory comments, and after the revisions had been scrutinized, the Report was received and commended to the churches without a dissenting vote.

Possibly all of the delegates at Amsterdam did not appreciate fully what this meant. Neither at Lausanne in 1927 nor at Edinburgh in 1937 was it possible to adopt statements in this field without the introduction of a separate paper by the Orthodox bodies. It was long feared that this could not be avoided at Amsterdam. Instead, on the closing

day came the co-operative and brotherly statement by Archbishop Germanos that these Reports would be studied carefully by the Orthodox Churches. At Amsterdam a choice had to be made between stating the unity which does exist, or having dissent toward a document expressing a unity which in fact is not yet to be found.

IV

Many American readers will feel that the Report of Section I is not a very prophetic document. In the nature of the case it was impossible that it should be such. It was not drawn up by individuals who were trying to chart the path which greater union might take. It was the work of delegates responsible to their several Churches to express the present mind of those Churches. We must keep constantly in mind that Amsterdam was not an informal Conference, but an official Assembly. It registered *the point where we are*. Those who condemn the Assembly for conservatism or timidity simply betray the fact that they are living under illusions concerning the present mind of the Churches. We cannot go further until the Churches are ready to do so. A generation must grow up in the larger Christian fellowship made possible by the World Council before the present barriers can be broken down.

Nothing could be more revealing concerning the difficult road still to be traveled than the words of an Anglican who has been very active personally in the ecumenical movement. He expressed the fear that some of his fellow-Anglicans could not conscientiously join in the final clause of the opening paragraph of the Report, "We are one in Jesus Christ." Several delegates replied that if we could not say that, our coming together at Amsterdam was a "lie." Yet, the fact remained that the theories of some did make it difficult to join in that affirmation without reservations. The shadow of "apostolic succession" was never far. It did not appear that the volume of essays edited by the Bishop of Oxford on *The Apostolic Ministry* had made any converts. But neither is the reply by T. W. Manson on *The Church's Ministry* likely to remove this barrier. Canon Ransay remarked, "An Anglican does not think about Bishops all the time any more than he is conscious of his backbone." But the analogy is most instructive. The rest of us must realize that there are Christians who are convinced that the Body of Christ has no backbone without the historic episcopacy as they interpret it.

This is the issue that primarily divides. The writer stated it to the Assembly in his address on the issues of Section I in these words:

> We are not at one in our understanding of the nature of continuity in the Church. . . . Some are firmly convinced that the only way in which true continuity is maintained is through what I would call a direct horizontal relationship with the Apostles whom Christ appointed. Where that continuity is broken, something essential is lacking in the marks of the Church. On the contrary, it is held just as passionately that the only way in which true continuity can be maintained is through a vertical relationship with the living Lord of the Church. Wherever that is found, there is his Church. No horizontal succession can assure this relationship, nor is any succession of human agents of any importance compared with a direct and vital association with Him who promised to be wherever two or three are gathered in His name.

Representatives from North India and Ceylon denied that this impasse still exists. They believe that the proposals for union in their countries have transcended this difficulty. Let us hope and pray that this may actually prove to be the case. Since the Bible promises that "A little child shall lead them," we should expect that it may be through the younger churches that the Spirit of God will lead the way to the united Church of tomorrow.

IMPRESSION OF THE DISCUSSION ON EVANGELISM

By WILHELM PAUCK

THE very fact that, in Section II, the Amsterdam Assembly concerned itself with evangelism was of great significance. For if it should come to pass that the evangelistic task be recognized as belonging to the whole church, the ecumenical idea would assume a hitherto unknown reality. Until now evangelistic activities have been primarily, if not exclusively, the concern of individual denominations and even of single groups and persons within the denomination. To be sure, the foreign missionary enterprise, which represents the churches' main evangelistic activity, has been carried on in some co-operative effort as it is symbolized in the International Missionary Council. Moreover, the Conferences of Madras and Whitby have proved to what an extent foreign missions have assumed an ecumenical character. Nevertheless, evangelism in the fullest sense still remains the responsibility of single ecclesiastical bodies.

It must have been in the mind of those who prepared the program of the Amsterdam Conference to focus the attention of the delegates chiefly upon evangelism as such and not primarily upon the missionary enterprise, in order to render the Churches aware of the fact that it lies in the very nature of the church to practice evangelism, i.e., to bear witness to the Gospel and to spread the Christian message to people everywhere on the earth. They must have hoped that they would thus cause the Churches to seek for a fresh understanding of the Gospel, so that they might become filled with a new sense of the commission that is the very ground of their being. Furthermore, the preparatory volume appears to have been designed in order to direct attention to the fact that, because so many people in so-called Christian nations are outwardly and inwardly estranged from the Gospel, special methods of communication are required for the effective execution of the evangelistic task.

It is an important accomplishment that these problems were raised at all, and it is to be hoped that they will be widely discussed in years to come as a result of their having been made part of the agenda of the Amsterdam Assembly.

I

The active discussions did not produce anything tangible in the direction of the solution of modern evangelistic problems. The meetings of the Section that concerned itself with "The Church's Witness to God's Design" were attended by delegates who, though most of them held positions of high leadership in their own denominations, did not possess special or extraordinary expertness in evangelistic affairs. By being made to discuss the problems of evangelism, they were subjected to an educational process which all the Churches belonging to the World Council will have to undergo. Among the consultants who were members of the Section were many leaders in evangelistic enterprises. Most of them were drawn from the field of foreign missions. Only a small number represented other evangelistic interests, e.g. social work or religious education. These consultants did not play a dominant role. It was good that they did not. For had they done so, the very purpose of the discussions would, in part at least, have been vitiated; for the whole purpose of including the topic of evangelism in the program was to render the Churches aware of their common responsibility.

The Commission which had had the task of preparing the second Amsterdam volume and initiating the discussions of the Assembly held a final preparatory meeting at Wondschoten. The members of this Commission, led by Dr. Hendrick Kraemer, were mainly those who, later on at Amsterdam, figured as consultants. They reviewed the work which had been done in preparation of the Assembly and they discussed the topics that should receive primary attention at Amsterdam. These conversations of about twenty-five experts and leaders were marked by a truly ecumenical spirit. Everyone of the participants was able to concentrate entirely on the task at hand and each showed a willingness to share in common work without paying unnecessary attention to his own or his own denomination's special traditions or prerogatives. Because the majority of those present at Wondschoten had had considerable experience in ecumenical co-operation, they were able to work together in the concerns of the whole Church without an artificial exaggeration or minimizing of their own church experiences or Christian convictions.

This group should have formulated a tentative draft of the Report which, according to the program, was to be submitted by the second

Section to the Amsterdam Assembly. But because Dr. Kraemer and Dr. Mackay, who later on became chairman of the Section, feared that such a statement would be regarded by the delegates as an interference with their own prerogatives, only a series of questions was prepared. These, it was hoped, might prove useful as the basis or the starting-point of the Amsterdam discussions.

This was the plan actually adopted at Amsterdam; but without good results. For there was not sufficient time to permit thorough common thinking on any of the questions raised. It would, therefore, have been much better if the Commission which had the responsibility of preparing the work of the Assembly had gone as far as to attempt the tentative formulation of a possible report. The members of the Section would still have had full freedom to alter the statement according to their own insights or wishes or even to reject it entirely; but they would have been compelled to concern themselves with the answers of the pertinent questions and not merely with the questions themselves, and they would thus have been saved from the instructive but not constructive job of getting acquainted with the problems.

II

It is not easy to characterize the discussions in detail. The Report which was submitted to the Assembly, and adopted by it with slight modifications, gives a fair picture of the conversations of the Section. The drafting committee, under the leadership of Bishop Stephen Neill, the genial and patient secretary of the Section, labored conscientiously not to include statements or assertions which could not fairly be regarded as reflecting the convictions of the delegates who had contributed to the debate. Bishop Neill and others would, as individuals, probably have gone further than the Section was able to go in emphasizing special evangelistic responsibilities and opportunities with which the Churches find themselves confronted at the present time. But they had to be content with a Report that reflected a mere beginning of a discussion of evangelism in an ecumenical forum.

The Report — to characterize it briefly — deals with the Christian message about the purpose of God as revealed in Christ, and then goes on to describe the present situation in terms of what the Church sees when it looks at the world (confusion!) and what the world sees when it looks at the Church (confusion tempered by faithfulness to the Gospel!). In the light of this the Church's task is described in three di-

rections: (1) Worship and witness which in the past have often been held in separation must be recognized to belong together. It is asserted that the witness of a Church that is held together by worship will be real only when all its members accept full responsibility for mutual service, breaking down all barriers of race and class. (2) The Church must recover "the spirit of prophecy to discern the signs of the times and to see the purpose of God working in the immense movements and revolutions of the present age." (What this means specifically, the Report unfortunately does not make plain!) (3) Each Christian group must be conscious of the world-wide fellowship of which it is a part.

Finally there follows a statement on missionary and evangelistic strategy in which the importance of lay work, the need of interdenominational co-operative evangelistic effort and the necessity of greater actualization of church unity are emphasized.

III

If somebody should raise the question how this Report is related to the preparatory volume on "The Church's Witness to God's Design," he must be told that the two have very little to do with one another. Indeed, the Amsterdam discussions were not related to the preparatory volume. In part this by-passing was intentional. For the Amsterdam volumes were designed to furnish background material to assist the delegates in preparing themselves for the conference. In part, however, the failure to use the work of the preparatory commission was due to the fact that the majority of the delegates had not seriously studied the volumes before they had come to Amsterdam.

In the discussions of the second Section, hardly a reference was made to the chapters of the preparatory volume. The only specific statement of this sort I can recall concerned the "axioms of modern man." In my opinion, these axioms collected from various parts of the world and printed in the volume without any comment present a telling picture of the state of mind of modern man to which the Church must address itself when it proclaims the Christian gospel. Some delegates chose to identify themselves with Professor Karl Barth who, in his Assembly address, had subjected the preparatory volumes to a scathing criticism from his own particular theological point of view. Almost reaffirming the attitude which had been characteristic of him in the early twenties ("Sit down, O man of God, you cannot do a thing . . .!") he had said:

I see lying over the material before us, . . . something like a deep mournful shadow which seems to arise from the fact that all too many are of the opinion that we Christians must accomplish what only God himself can bring to pass and what he wills to bring to pass by himself: this, namely, that men should really come to faith through orally hearing the Gospel. Let us step out from under this mournful shadow! We are allowed to be God's witnesses but he has not called us to be his lawyers, engineers, managers, statisticians, and administrative directors. We are therefore not burdened with the cares that go with such activity in his service. Really, how do we come to the fantastic opinion that secularism and godlessness are inventions of our time . . .? How do we arrive at the sorry notion of starting our evangelistic approach to modern men by drawing up a tabular view of their wicked axioms: as though we were allowed to regard these worldly people of today from any other standpoint than that Jesus Christ died and rose again for them and became their divine brother and redeemer!

The criticisms of Barth's, and of those who supported him, show to what an extent the problem of communication, which lies at the very heart of the evangelistic task, is not recognized in its true nature by many leaders of the church. The Report of Section II contains the sentence that "The Church has largely lost touch with the dominant realities of modern life and still tries to meet the modern world with language and a technique that may have been appropriate two hundred years ago." These words suggest the issues of modern evangelism much more accurately and realistically than Barth's criticism does. Therefore I regret that the discussions of the Section were not directed to the problem of evangelistic methods and techniques. Had this been done, the actual church situation all over the present world would have been brought into focus in a realistic way.

IV

In conclusion, I wish to record certain random impressions which forced themselves upon my mind in the course of the meetings of the Section:

1. The spokesmen of the younger churches played a rather prominent part. They held the floor just as often as the representatives of the older churches did. What they said was often something very simple and even platitudinous, but they appeared to attribute great significance to the fact that they had the opportunity to give testimony of their Christian faith before a forum of the world-wide church. The fact that they were freely given this opportunity proves how truly

ecumenical the setting is which the World Council of Churches provides.

2. While some spokesmen of the older churches, especially the Eastern Orthodox and the Lutherans, rose again and again to warn that ecumenicity must not mean interdenominationalism or an abolition of denominational distinctions and privileges, the representatives of the younger churches pleaded repeatedly and with one accord for Christian unity and visible unanimity. Thus they continued to render the service by which they have already deeply influenced the modern Protestant mind in an ecumenical direction.

3. That the Assembly of the World Council of Churches was not a "Western" or "American" conference was rendered obvious by the fact that many non-occidental speakers subjected Western civilization to very sharp criticisms. To be sure, most of these criticisms were not unknown to the representatives of the West; they had probably uttered them themselves or heard them from the lips of countrymen of their own. But coming so forcefully and widely from Orientals and Africans and South Americans they must have led many an American to the shocked realization that Western civilization and particularly that of America is not too "popular" in the world of today. Also in Section II, the West was attacked on account of its imperialism, aggressiveness and materialism. Some did not hesitate to declare that they believed it to be moribund.

It was therefore no surprise to hear the insistence of several of the Orientals that the Conference should avoid by all means the mistake of speaking in such a way as to suggest an identification of Christianity with Western civilization. But what did astonish me was to hear them say that while the West was in the throes of cultural pessimism, they were experiencing in their civilizations a profound optimism, caused by the liberation which many of their people had been granted as a result of scientific-technological and political-social advances.

I must not fail to add that I had, and still have, great difficulty in believing these reports. Somehow I am of the opinion that the cultural climate of India and of China cannot be an optimistic one. I may have to change my opinion. My readiness to do so, if I should find that the statements of the Amsterdam-Orientals can be corroborated, would be one partial result of my attendance of the Amsterdam meetings.

THE CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL DISORDER

An Interpretation of the Report of Amsterdam Section III

By JOHN C. BENNETT

I HAVE been asked to write an interpretation of the Report of the third Section of the Assembly, the Section on "The Church and the Social Disorder." It is rather difficult for anyone who was so close to the work of that Section to have any perspective on it, but I am glad to explain the intentions of those who drafted the Report because it is one that is in danger of being misunderstood in the United States. It should be emphasized that this Report which dealt with very controversial issues had to be kept within such limits of space that full clarification of the points made was impossible.

First, I shall say something about the Section itself. It had about a hundred and twenty members. These represented a very good cross-section of the Churches so far as nations and confessions were concerned. The weakness of the Section was the small proportion of laymen. About half of the members were laymen in the sense that they were unordained, but only about fifteen were engaged in business or politics or in professions closely related to the hardest economic and social problems. There was no member of a trade union in the Section. That was in part a result of the fact that the Churches draw their leadership from the middle classes; but too much should not be made of that fact in this connection because of the very small number of business men who were present. Their absence could hardly be ascribed to a lack of business men in the lay leadership of the Church. In both cases we must recognize the difficulty of getting laymen who can take the time to come to such meetings. They are not masters of their own time as much as is the case with the clergy and teachers. Two laymen did play a very large part in the work of the Section: the Chairman, Dr. Patijn who is the Dutch member of the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations, and Charles P. Taft. Mr. Taft admirably performed the function of keeping the Section aware of concrete realities as they appear to many American laymen. In all, there were twenty-five Americans in the Section. The vice-chairmen of the

Section were Bishop J. Arthur Hamlett, Sir Walter Moberly and Bishop Y. Y. Tsu.

The Section had six mornings for discussion. The first three mornings were devoted to as many as fifty brief speeches on the problems with which the Report was to deal. The last three mornings were given to the consideration of drafts of the Report. The whole Report went through three drafts and then was amended after almost two hours of discussion in the plenary session of the Assembly. I mention this matter of mechanics because a process of this kind puts the Report in a different class from resolutions that are often passed by Church councils without much opportunity to study or discuss them. The most intensive discussion of the drafts was done in a rather large drafting committee which worked many hours. This committee consisted of the following: Professor Emil Brunner (Switzerland), Canon V. A. Demant (Britain), Professor von Dietze (Germany), Mr. G. V. Job (India), Sir Walter Moberly (Britain), Professor D. Moraitis (Greece), Professor Reinhold Niebuhr (U.S.A.), Mr. Charles P. Taft (U.S.A.). In addition there were the chairman and the secretary (Holland and U.S.A.). The Report was truly the work of the committee as a whole.

One of the most striking features of the discussions in the Section was the contribution of members of the younger Churches. I am sure that they still feel that the Report is primarily a Western document in which some sentences are inserted to take account of their contributions. That is in the main a fair criticism. And yet I am sure that they have done far more than they realize to modify the tone and emphasis of the Report as a whole. There were two emphases that were most characteristic of the members of the Section from Asia and Africa. They were critical of the American and European tendency to take a negative and pessimistic attitude toward modern technical civilization. They represented countries that have not had enough technology yet and they see it chiefly as a means of lifting burdens from the people. In general we may say that the optimists in ecumenical circles now are not the Americans but the Asiatics because, baffling as their problems are, they have great hope both from technology and from political independence. The second emphasis characteristic of the representatives of the younger Churches was their interpretation of the revolutionary forces in their own countries. Not one of them was sympathetic toward communism in a positive way but most of them had sympathy with the *motives* that cause people in Asia and Africa to accept communism

as a movement of protest against imperialism, poverty and racial discrimination. The Section as a whole shared this attitude, as the Report indicates, but it was expressed most forcefully by the members from Asia and Africa.

The preparatory work for this Section, the results of which will be published in the third of the Amsterdam volumes, dealt quite largely with diagnosis. Dr. Oldham's chapters in that volume were accepted as background for the discussion. But it was decided to limit all consideration of diagnosis to a few paragraphs of the Report. The main problem that emerged in the area of diagnosis was the relationship between the specifically contemporary causes of the present crisis, especially the development of technics, and human sin that finds expression in every age. The first part of the Report shows how necessary it is to understand the ways in which the perennial and the contemporary causes of the present crisis are woven together. There is no fatalism in the Report. It is clearly stated that men do have freedom to counteract the tendencies that are natural in a technical civilization though they cannot eliminate these tendencies and, so to speak, reverse history. It is also clearly stated that one of the greatest sources of confusion is the way in which men believe that some external changes will overcome human sin. The Report says: "New temptations to greed and power arise even in systems more just than those they have replaced because sin is ever present in the human heart."

The part of the Report that needs most interpretation, especially in America, is the part that deals with communism and capitalism. There is one paragraph that has received most attention in the American press and I shall quote it in full:

> The Christian Church rejects the ideologies of both Communism and *laissez-faire* Capitalism, and should seek to draw men away from the false assumption that these extremes are the only alternatives. Each has made promises which it could not redeem. Communist ideology puts the emphasis upon economic justice, and promises that freedom will come automatically after the completion of the revolution. Capitalism puts the emphasis upon freedom, and promises that justice will follow as a by-product of free enterprise; that, too, is an ideology which has been proved false. It is the responsibility of Christians to seek new creative solutions which never allow either justice or freedom to destroy the other.

The first sentence, as I have quoted it, includes an alteration in the text that was made after the Assembly voted to receive the Report and after the press had published that sentence in its original form as the

"lead" sentence. The original version did not include the words *laissez-faire* or the word *extreme*. That made it seem to be a more complete condemnation of capitalism than was intended. The alteration was accepted by the drafting committee in the interest of clarity. I believe that the paragraph as a whole in its original form was not misleading but that the first sentence torn from its context did invite misunderstanding. I accept as much responsibility as anyone for any harm that may have been done. It should, however, be explained in defense of drafting committee that the unamended text was mimeographed and discussed by the Section and then after a day's interval by the plenary session and during that whole time no one criticized it.

One difficulty is the word "ideology." It is not understood very widely in America that capitalism has an ideology. In Europe there is a strong tendency to speak of the spiritual and cultural aspects of capitalism and ascribe to it an extensive ideology. There were those in the Section who desired more emphasis upon the ideology of capitalism. Even the unamended text limits the meaning of the ideology of capitalism to the assumption that "justice will follow as a by-product of free enterprise." Actually the word ideology was used to distinguish between this false assumption of capitalism and the *mechanisms* of capitalism as a way of producing and distributing goods. The latter were criticized in the preceding paragraph of the report for some of their specific effects but they were not condemned as a whole. This paragraph dealt only with false assumptions characteristic of both capitalism and communism. The fact that the assumptions of *laissez-faire* are still used to defend forms of capitalism that contain large elements of monopoly in them makes this paragraph sufficiently inclusive in its amended form.

The great brevity of the report has given some critics the false impression that communism and capitalism are put on the same level and equally condemned. This is not true at all. There are two paragraphs which enumerate the evils which Christians find in communism and capitalism. The one on communism mentions five points of conflict between Christianity and communism and in each case it refers to something that is inherent in contemporary communism as a movement. When the evils of capitalism are discussed they are always referred to as tendencies and it is clearly said that there has been a considerable corrective of some of those tendencies by "the influence of trade unions, social legislation and responsible management."

In Part II of the Report there is a very brief but carefully balanced

discussion of the "economic and political organization" of society. Here it is clear that the Section has avoided advocacy of any stereotyped system. It points to the dangers of both socialism and capitalism and emphasizes both the need of some central direction of economic life and the need of decentralization and of a variety of centers of initiative. It calls attention to the perennial problems in every economic order for which there is no panacea. The Report avoids attaching any label to its positive proposal. In some countries it would have the appearance of a modified capitalism and in other countries it would have the appearance of a modified socialism. Such expressions as "the middle way" or "the third force" have also been avoided. The assumption underlying the report is that there is no *Christian* economic system but that there are limits between which Christians should experiment to develop economic institutions which fit concrete situations. This does not mean that the Christian way is always in the middle. Individual Christians will necessarily differ in their emphases and it is to be expected that they will, as citizens, identify themselves with programs that are sometimes to the right and sometimes to the left of what we may call "the ecumenical center." In a capitalist country they should be on the alert against unjust inequalities and the danger that men will be victims of what the Report calls "a kind of fate which has taken the form of such social catastrophes as mass unemployment." In a socialist country they should be on the alert against what the Report calls "inordinate combinations of political and economic power, culminating finally in an omnicompetent state." An ecumenical report that tries to speak to both types of situation must necessarily suggest wide limits within which Christians should find their way.

The Report was careful to avoid a purely negative attitude toward communism. It does strongly attack communism in its present totalitarian form and it shows the basic religious error that underlies communism, the promise of complete redemption from social evil in history. But before it attacked communism the Section expressed solidarity with the masses of humanity to whom communism makes a strong appeal and it confessed that the Church shares responsibility for the unjust conditions which cause men to turn to communism as a means of deliverance. The Report says:

> It is a great human tragedy that so much that is good in the motives and aspirations of many Communists and of those whose sympathies they win has been

transformed into a force that engenders new forms of injustice and oppression, and that what is true in Communist criticism should be used to give convincing power to untrustworthy propaganda.

There was one remarkable feature of the whole discussion of this Report. At no time in the Section and only once in the plenary session of the whole Assembly was there a word of criticism of it from the conservative side. All the criticisms of this most controversial part of the report (except one by President Franklin Fry) called for a strengthening of the criticism of capitalism. Many would have preferred an absolute condemnation of capitalism. The French delegation, for example, brought an amendment into the plenary session of the Assembly which was voted down on the recommendation of Dr. Patijn. This amendment condemned capitalism "because it makes man the creature of money and totalitarian Communism because it makes man the creature of the collectivity." It is significant that the first speaker in the plenary session, who endorsed the Report strongly and called only for some additions, was a leader of the younger Tories in the British House of Commons, Mr. Quentin Hogg. Mr. Charles Taft was responsible for the final amendment that inserted the words *"laissez-faire"* before capitalism and added the word *extreme* in that very controversial sentence quoted above. But he has always expressed general approval of the Report. One of the mysteries of the Assembly was the silence in the Section and in the plenary session of those who may have felt that the report went too far in its criticism of capitalism.

I know that there are many members of the Churches who will not agree with the main emphasis of the report. They are probably most numerous in America. These members of the Church were not adequately represented at Amsterdam. The ecclesiastical leaders and the theologians were well represented at Amsterdam and, for the most part, this Report is their work. But there is more than that to be said: the Report has a claim to be ecumenical. Any report that said less in criticism of capitalism would be unacceptable both to a large part of the leadership of the American Churches but also to the Churches on all other continents. My hope is that as the Report is read in full by Americans the fact that it is really a very balanced document will be clearly seen and its refusal to prescribe or condemn systems as such will enable the critical believer in capitalism and the critical socialist to find in it much common ground.

THE CHURCHES AND THE INTERNATIONAL DISORDER

By WALTER W. VAN KIRK

THE Report of the Section on "The Church and the International Disorder" (Section IV) as received by the Assembly of the World Council of Churches and recommended to the churches for their study, voiced the conviction that "there is no irresistible tide that is carrying man to destruction." This note of hope, however, was accompanied by a stern warning that if war is to be avoided man will have to turn to God in repentance and obey his holy will.

Said the Report:

> While we know that wars sometimes arise from immediate causes which Christians seem unable to influence, we need not work blindly or alone. We are laborers together with God who in Christ has given us the way of overcoming demonic forces in history. Through the churches, working together under His power, a fellowship is being developed which rises above those barriers of race, color, class and nation that now set men against each other in conflict.

The Report goes on to say: "It is required of us that we be faithful and obedient. The event is with God. Thus every man may serve the cause of peace, confident that no matter what happens — he is neither lost nor futile, for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth."

This note of assurance that under the guidance of the Holy Spirit good can be made to triumph over evil, is more convincingly stated in the Report of Section IV than in the preliminary papers.

Other more specific shifts of emphasis, as well as amplifications of pre-Amsterdam ecumenical thinking, are noted in the following summary of the Report of the Section.

I

War is Contrary to the Will of God. There had been only scant reference in the pre-Amsterdam documents on the relation of the individual Christian to war and participation in war. Kenneth G. Grubb, in his treatment of "The World of Power" had raised this problem in abbreviated form. He had held that "the Christian attitude to war has

not been rendered any easier by recent developments of destructiveness and Christians are still divided about the issue." Mr. Grubb had gone on to say: "There is a settled Christian conviction that the use of force, however unavoidable it may be for the fulfillment of the distinctive tasks of the state, is in itself absolutely opposed to the commandment of love. It can only be used as the lesser of two evils in reliance on divine forgiveness."

This fragmentary treatment of the pacifist issue was deemed by Section IV to be inconclusive and unsatisfactory. Practically one entire session was devoted to a discussion of the question whether modern war could ever be regarded as a "just" process of resolving differences between nations.

No pacifist can say that his position was not thoroughly explored in the Section discussions. It appeared to the writer that the number of persons in this Section holding pacifist views was somewhat larger in proportion to the membership of the Section than the proportion of pacifists in relation to the total body of the Christian community. It might also be added that those who defended the pacifist thesis within the Section were mainly clergymen or those who were in some professional relationship to the churches, whereas those who were most vocal in opposing the pacifist view were laymen and non-ecclesiastics, certain of whom had borne the responsibilities of government during the war years.

The Section was of a common mind in asserting that "war as a method of settling disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ." Due account was taken of the fact that the problem of war raises especially acute issues for Christians. This was true because warfare had greatly changed and that the widespread and indiscriminate destruction inherent in the conduct of modern war had tended to obliterate the moral distinction between "just" and "unjust" wars.

Inasmuch as no agreement could be reached either on the question of pacifism or the question of war being a "just" method of dealing with international disputes, the Section recommended the setting forth of the following propositions:

There are those who hold that, even though entering a war may be a Christian's duty in particular circumstances, modern warfare, with its mass destruction, can never be an act of justice.

In the absence of impartial supranational institutions, there are those who hold that military action is the ultimate sanction of the rule of law, and that citizens must be distinctly taught that it is their clear duty to defend the law by force if necessary.

Others, again, refuse military service of all kinds, convinced that an absolute witness against war and for peace is for them the will of God and they desire that the Church should speak to the same effect.

Having stated these three positions the Section frankly acknowledged its "deep sense of perplexity in face of these conflicting views" and urged "upon all Christians the duty of wrestling continuously with the difficulties they raise and of praying humbly for God's guidance."

It was specified that "the churches must continue to hold within their full fellowship all who sincerely profess such viewpoints as those set out above and are prepared to submit themselves to the will of God in the light of such guidance as may be vouchsafed to them."

Section IV was not content, however, with defining these conflicting views. It asserted that the churches must attack the causes of war by promoting peaceful change and the pursuit of justice, standing for the maintenance of good faith and the honouring of the pledged word; resisting the pretensions of imperialistic power; promoting the multilateral reduction of armaments and by combatting indifference and despair in the face of the futility of war. It was recommended that the victor nations in the second World War hasten the making of just peace treaties, return prisoners of war to their homes and bring to a rapid end purges and trials for war crimes.

II

Peace Requires an Attack on the Causes of Conflict between the Nations. The Section then turned its attention to the existing tensions between East and West and the critical situation deriving from the conflict between what some have described as the "police states" and the "free societies."

Speaking before a plenary session of the Assembly, Mr. John Foster Dulles of the United States and Professor Joseph L. Hromadka of Czechoslovakia, the former a layman with wide experience in the field of international law and diplomacy, the latter a theologian of distinction, now Dean of the John Huss Faculty in Prague, set the pattern for the subsequent discussion in Section IV on the East-West issue. Both of these churchmen had contributed papers for the pre-Amsterdam

volume on *The Church and the International Disorder*. Their Assembly addresses conformed in spirit and outlook to the premises and conclusions embodied in their preliminary documents.

Mr. Dulles characterized communism as atheistic and materialistic. He ascribed to Stalin the view that laws are merely the means whereby those in power carry out their will. It was conceded that certain similarities exist between the social and economic ends that communists profess and those that Christians seek. "But the methods taught," said Mr. Dulles, "are utterly dissimilar and the present methods of communism are incompatible with peaceful change." The solution to the East–West conflict, according to Mr. Dulles, "is for those who have faith to exert themselves more vigorously to translate their faith into works." "Those who believe in the moral law and human dignity," he said, "must be more concerned to make social institutions reflect those ideals. In that way they can provide an example that others will follow and a unifying process will be begun."

Professor Hromadka argued that mankind is witnessing the end of Western supremacy within the realm of the international order. "The era of the Western man," he said, "is approaching its end under a terrific storm which is sweeping through all humanity." This alleged decadence of the West was said to be due to the fact that "the prosperity and the relative political and international security under the flags of the Western nations had made the leaders and the rank and file citizens of the West either self-complacent or reliant increasingly on material power, either economic or military, rather than on moral and spiritual resources." Professor Hromadka disclaimed saying that the West is irrevocably and incurably condemned to final collapse. "What I have in mind," he said "is Western man's apparent fear, frustration and helplessness in dealing with the great issues of our times."

Both Mr. Dulles and Professor Hromadka agreed that it would be as futile as it would be suicidal to meet the challenge of East versus West by reliance upon military measures and resort to war.

In the Report as finally approved by Section IV and transmitted by the Assembly to the churches, it was recognized that Soviet–Western relations could not be neatly packaged and dealt with apart from the totality of the world's ills. In this respect the Section Report hewed closely to the line laid down in the preliminary papers. If the preliminary paper by Mr. Dulles was severely critical of the methods of intolerance practiced by the Soviet Union, so, too, was the Section Re-

port. Similarly, Professor Hromadka could point to the Section findings as confirming, at least in part, his pre-Amsterdam observations. But these indictments of the systems and ideologies of East and West were not given geographical or national labels. Russia was not mentioned in this part of the Report. Nor was the United States or any other Western state. It was recognized that Christianity could not be equated with capitalism, or communism, or any other particular economic or political system. "There are elements in all systems which we must condemn," the Section said, "when they contravene the First Commandment, infringe basic human rights, and contain a potential threat to the peace."

All forms of tyranny, political, economic or religious, which deny liberty to men, were denounced, as were all types of totalitarianism wherever found "in which a state arrogates to itself the right of determining men's thoughts and actions instead of recognizing the right of each individual to do God's will according to his conscience." "We resist all endeavors," the Section said, "to spread a system of thought or of economics by unscrupulous intolerance, suppression or persecution."

Mr. Dulles had written before Amsterdam that "Christians must see to it that their nations demonstrate that peaceful methods can realize the goals which we all espouse." To this Section IV agreed, adding that "a positive attempt must be made to ensure that competing economic systems such as communism, socialism, or free enterprise may co-exist without leading to war." The churches, it was held, have a responsibility to educate men to rise above the limitations of their national outlooks and to view economic and political differences in the light of the Christian objective of ensuring to every man freedom from all economic or political bondage.

III

The Nations of the World Must Acknowledge the Rule of Law. Section IV reinforced the pre-Amsterdam papers respecting the need of establishing legal institutions under the aegis of which the processes of peaceful change might be facilitated. Baron F. M. Asbeck and Mr. Dulles, both in their preliminary documents and in their Section presentations, had deplored the fact that there does not now exist in international society a true, universally accepted legal authority above the

sovereign states. Baron Van Asbeck had argued that the United Nations, despite the heroic efforts put forth by that body to effect the integration of world society, rested primarily and overwhelmingly on the various and diverging legal orders of the member states. This being so, the United Nations, he said, could be described as a political, unstable order, in which considerations of influence and power, only weakly restrained by conceptions of right and justice, defined decisions and delegated responsibilities. "As long as an effective authority above the states has not been installed," Baron Van Asbeck argued, "national authority will wish in this disunited, unintegrated world to dispose as long as possible and to the utmost degree, of political influence and power as well as of the obedience of its citizens."

Similarly, Mr. Dulles had argued that, "if force is discarded as the accepted means of change, then there have to be established procedures and political institutions for the purpose of making peaceful change."

Section IV found no difficulty in reaching agreement at this point. Inasmuch as the Lord Jesus Christ is Sovereign, it was denied that the state could claim absolute sovereignty or make laws without regard to the commandments of God and the welfare of mankind. Each state, it was asserted, must accept its responsibility under the governance of God, and its subordination to law, within the society of nations. It was seen that international law requires international institutions for its effectiveness and that these institutions must come to grips with international problems on their own merits and not primarily in the light of national interests.

The declared purpose of the United Nations to assist in the settlement of difficulties and to promote friendly relations among nations were warmly endorsed by the Section. It was nevertheless asserted that "unless the nations surrender a greater measure of national sovereignty in the interest of the common good, they will be tempted to have recourse to war in order to enforce their claims."

The question whether or not it is advisable, at this time, to press for some form of world government, was raised in Section IV. Baron Van Asbeck, in his preliminary paper had said:

> If the expression "world government" has to be taken in the sense of a unitary government of the whole world on the pattern of national governments, the answer clearly must be "No." It must be emphasized that such a Leviathan

would crush us all. But if this means stressing the need for a gradual building up of a common authority in the appropriate fields of activity the answer should be "Yes." . . . The United Nations must always be on the watch for opportunities of intensifying a more truly federal co-operation between states in a certain group, by their common subjection to a superior authority.

Mr. Dulles had observed:

There is an absence of the foundation needed for building a world structure which has political power to legislate change. . . . Today, any world-wide system for institutionalizing change would inevitably be despotic. Either it would vest arbitrary power in the person of a few individual officials, or it would vest great power in the small fraction of the human race who have tested political processes for reflecting the individual choice.

With these views Section IV was in essential agreement. It said:

While pressing for more comprehensive and authoritative world organization, they [the churches] should at present support immediate practical steps for fostering mutual understanding and goodwill among the nations, for promoting respect for international law and the establishment of the international institutions which are now possible. They should also support every effort to deal on a universal basis with the many specific questions of international concern which face mankind today, such as the use of atomic power, the multilateral reduction of armaments, and the provision for health services and food for all men. They should endeavor to secure that the United Nations be further developed to serve such purposes. They should insist that the domestic laws of each country conform to the principles of progressive international law. . . .

IV

The Observance of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms Should Be Encouraged by Domestic and International Law. The preliminary papers had stressed the obligation resting upon Christians to promote respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Dr. O. Frederick Nolde, in his pre-Amsterdam manuscript on "Freedom of Religion and Related Human Rights," had declared that "Christians have a valid concern that all human rights — civil, social and economic — should be respected everywhere . . . Christians believe that respect for human rights is essential to world order."

In the development of his argument Dr. Nolde had laid down three presuppositions as validating the claim that man has the right to freedom, particularly to freedom of religion. These presuppositions were: (1) the Christian conception of man's freedom is derived from

the faith that man is made in the image of God; (2) the dignity which is claimed for man is attested by the demonstration of God's love for him in Jesus Christ; (3) the right of every man to freedom is imperative in order that he may be in a position to respond to the calling wherewith God has called him.

In the light of these presuppositions it had been held that it was presumptuous for the state either to grant or to deny fundamental rights and freedom to men, inasmuch as these rights were derived from man's nature as a child of God. It was for the state to safeguard these rights; it was for the individual to exercise these rights with due regard for his responsibility both to society and to God.

Dr. Nolde had then reviewed the activities of the United Nations in the area of human rights. He had interpreted the principles of the Charter respecting human rights, and had summarized the negotiations looking toward the drafting of a Declaration and a Covenant of Human Rights. Particular attention had been given to the question of religious freedom. In conclusion Dr. Nolde had drawn up a proposed Declaration on Religious Liberty.

The discussions in Section IV and the actions taken by this group on all matters related to human rights bore a striking resemblance to Dr. Nolde's pre-Amsterdam paper. It was affirmed that

> All men are equal in the sight of God and . . . the rights of men derive directly from their status as the children of God. . . . It is for the state to embody these rights in its own legal system and to ensure their observance in practice. . . . However . . . there are no rights without duties. Man's freedom has its counterpart in man's responsibility, and each person has a responsibility towards his fellows in the community.

The Section expressed its concern over flagrant violations of human rights evidenced from many parts of the world. "Both individuals and groups," it was said, "are subjected to persecution and discrimination on grounds of race, color, religion, culture or political conviction." "Against such actions," it was affirmed, "whether of governments, officials, or the general public, the churches must take a firm and vigorous stand, through local action, in co-operation with churches in other lands, and through international institutions of legal order."

The churches were called upon "to support every endeavor to secure within an international bill of rights adequate safeguards for freedom of religion and conscience, including rights of all men to hold

and change their faith, to express it in worship and practice, to teach and persuade others, and to decide on the religious education of their children." "They should press," it was said, "for freedom of speech and expression, of association and assembly, the rights of the family, of freedom from arbitrary arrest, as well as all those other rights which the true freedom of man requires." The churches were urged to oppose "with all the resources at their disposal" enforced segregation on grounds of race and color, and called upon to work "for the progressive recognition and application of this principle in every country." In a mood of self-examination the Section declared it to be essential that "the churches observe these fundamental rights in their own membership and life, thus giving to others an example of what freedom means in practice."

The Assembly of the World Council approved a recommendation of the Section which called upon its constituent members "to support the efforts to secure acceptance of an International Bill of Human Rights, including a Declaration, a Covenant or Covenants, and Measures of Enforcement, and to urge that this work be carried to completion as rapidly as possible." The Assembly, again upon the recommendation of the Section, called upon its constituent members to support the adoption of other conventions on human rights, such as those on Genocide and Freedom of Information and the Press, as a step toward the promotion of respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms throughout the world.

In yet another action the Assembly adopted for itself the Declaration on Religious Liberty, the precise text of which had been embodied in Dr. Nolde's preliminary paper. This Declaration set forth four propositions:

1. Every person has the right to determine his own faith and creed.
2. Every person has the right to express his religious belief in worship, teaching and practice, and to proclaim the implication of his beliefs for relationships in a social or political community.
3. Every person has the right to associate with others and to organize with them for religious purposes.
4. Every religious organization, formed or maintained by action in accordance with the rights of individual persons, has the right to determine its policies and practices for the accomplishment of its chosen purposes.

The non-Roman churches have in this Declaration a statement of

the essential requirements of religious liberty which may well prove to be of historic significance.

Section IV had had some difficulty in its search for a common mind on the broad question of peace and war. In happy contrast, unanimity was quickly reached on the issue of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including religious liberty.

V

The Churches and All Christian Peoples Have Obligations in the Face of International Disorder. In their preparatory papers for Amsterdam, Dr. Roswell P. Barnes and Mr. Kenneth G. Grubb had explored the methods by which the churches might most effectively exercise their influence in the field of international affairs. It had been declared that the effectiveness of action by the churches depended on its being closely matched with the real demands of a given situation; that the churches must raise their voices even if they did not seem to be heard. It had been acknowledged that differences existed between those who hold that it is the duty of the churches to influence and form convictions upon international relations as such, and those who hold that it is their duty to state and guide the attitude of Christians toward them. It had been pointed out that these differences were partly traceable to the theological and historical background of the churches. The conclusion had been reached that "the Christian testimony to the permanence of absolute principles, to the existence of values which have not been, and cannot be, created by the unaided effort of statesmen, philosophers or scientists, is a contribution . . . to international affairs that is badly needed."

Six forms of action by the churches had been enumerated by Dr. Barnes and Mr. Grubb: prayer, negotiation, consultation, reconciliation, education and publicity. The Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, jointly instituted by the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council, had been cited as the type of agency through which the churches might appropriately concert their influence on international problems and situations. It had been pointed out that the primary responsibility of this Commission was to serve the churches, Councils and conferences which are members of the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council as a source of stimulus and knowledge in their

approach to international problems; as a medium of common counsel and action, and as their organ in formulating the Christian mind on world issues and in bringing that mind effectively to bear upon such issues.

Section IV was in basic agreement with these proposals. In its report to the Assembly, the Section charged that the churches had been guilty both of indifference and of failure. "While they [the churches] desire more open honesty and less self-righteousness among governments and all concerned with international relations they cannot cast a first stone or excuse themselves for complacency."

The opinion was unanimous that

> it is the duty of the Christian to pray for all men, especially for those in authority; to combat both hatred, and resignation in regard to war; to support negotiation rather than primary reliance upon arms as an instrument of policy; and to sustain such national policies as in his judgment best reflect Christian principles. He should respond to the demand of the Christian vocation upon his life as a citizen, make sacrifices for the hungry and homeless, and, above all, win men for Christ, and thus enlarge the bounds of the supranational fellowship.

As for the church, as a corporate entity, it was its duty to eliminate discrimination among its members "on unworthy grounds"; it must educate its members respecting international policies in the light of their faith; it must witness to the moral law and it must support leaders and those in authority in their endeavor to build the sure foundations of a just world order.

The establishment of the World Council of Churches was seen as a living expression of that spiritual fellowship transcending race and nation, class and culture, which, in the last analysis, is indispensable to the achieving of a durable peace. The aim of the World Council of Churches was said to be "to hasten international reconciliation through its own members and through the co-operation of all Christian Churches and of all men of goodwill." It will strive to see international differences in the light of God's design, remembering that normally there are Christians on both sides of every frontier. It should not weary in the effort to state the Christian understanding of the will of God and to promote its application to national and international policy. In addition to transmitting the report of Section IV to the churches, the Assembly specifically authorized the Commission of

the Churches on International Affairs to proceed with its work upon the basis of the Charter approved by the Cambridge Conference in 1946.

Regardless of the theological differences reflected in the discussions of Section IV, these differences did not stand in the way of enunciating, in principle, a program of action on the international front that will challenge the churches of the world during the years ahead.

Section IV concluded its report on a note of confidence. It said:

> Great are the tasks and fateful the responsibilities laid on Christians today. . . . In our own strength we can do nothing; but our hope is in Christ and in the coming of His Kingdom. With Him is the victory and in Him we trust. We pray that we may be strengthened by the power of His might and used by Him for accomplishing His design among the nations, for He is the Prince of Peace and the Risen and Living Head of the Church.

WOMEN AT AMSTERDAM

By TWILA LYTTON CAVERT

FROM a statistical point of view, one might look with some discouragement at the fact that out of the four-hundred-and-fifty official delegates at Amsterdam only sixteen were women. Or again on the Central Committee which will guide the destinies of the World Council of Churches between Assemblies, there are only two women (both Americans) out of a total of ninety. But there are other factors more encouraging to the women of the churches. It is of these that I wish to write because some of them may prove of great importance in the future of the ecumenical movement.

A correspondent writing in the London *Spectator* of the Assembly said "Two cheers early in the life of the Assembly were given for references to the place of laymen and women in the Church and these two themes recurred continually." The hope expressed in many quarters both before and during the Assembly, that the life and work of women in the Church should be given recognition and should be further explored as a source of power for the renewal of the Church, was realized to a very considerable extent.

I

It was not just a "happenstance" that this subject came to be as much in the forefront of leaders' and delegates' minds as it was. Throughout Christian history, from the days of our Lord's recognition of women as "persons in their own right" — as his friends and co-workers — to the present, women have been among the most eager bearers of the Good News and devout supporters in countless ways of God's gift of the Church. But in innumerable histories of the Christian movement, and in many notable ecclesiastical assemblies, women are only to be noted by their absence and lack of recognition. The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches, ecclesiastically constituted as it was, might easily have followed in the train of these many other church councils and bodies. In what lay the difference? Why were women reckoned as "those present" and worthy to be counted even more than their numerical representation in the Assembly might seem to warrant?

The answer to this question leads our thought to an enquiry initiated under the auspices of the Study Department of the World Council two-and-a-half years ago dealing with "The Life and Work of Women in the Church." An unexpected and unprecedented response to this enquiry, from all over the world, directed the minds of leaders in the ecumenical movement to the women of the churches as a reservoir of power and devotion — one only partially recognized and used.

In this study thousands of women from fifty-eight countries have been associated. A surprising response stirring everyone's imagination came not only from the women of the older churches of the West and the younger churches of Africa, Latin America and the Orient, but also from the Orthodox churches and from such ancient churches as those of Egypt and Armenia.

In this enquiry, women were asked not only to contribute to a world-wide picture of what the women of the churches were doing in their voluntary organizations, as professional workers, as women clergy, as members of governing boards and policy-making groups; but also to indicate what some of the prevailing arrangements were in the various communions for the inclusion of women in the leadership of the churches, how the practice of the churches compared with changing attitudes concerning the deployment of women's gifts and abilities in other areas of life, and what church women were thinking about their opportunities for witness, service and vocation in the Church.

II

It was not only the volume of response to these questions which was notable but even more so the revelation of the bewildering and confusing variety of attitudes and arrangements in various communions relating to women's place and function. Furthermore the cultural upheavals around the world affecting women and their responsibilities in church, home and society were vividly portrayed.

It was revealed over and over again that conflicting Biblical and theological interpretations dealing with the "man-woman" relationship, together with the heavy hand of tradition and prejudice, give women of the churches throughout the world a sense of not knowing "who they are" in the household of faith, and often result in the younger generation seeking fellowship and service elsewhere than in the Church.

Throughout the memoranda submitted from the different parts of

the world, there was a constantly expressed desire for an ecumenical understanding and fellowship among the women of the churches and the reiterated hope that the World Council of Churches might provide opportunities, not only for such fellowship and sharing of methods of work, but also for men and women working together to discover Christian answers to some fundamental questions about the "man-woman" relationship both in the service of the Church and within the home and community.

It was thus that, when the Assembly program came to be built, there were many and specific requests from the women of the churches around the world asking for consideration at Amsterdam, and if possible for some organizational arrangement within the World Council itself in order that further explanation and fellowship might be achieved.

III

As a result of such requests, the subject "The Life and Work of Women in the Church" came to be included in the program of the Assembly as a "Concern" to be dealt with by a special committee of sixty-five men and women delegates from the churches throughout the world.

As a further evidence of its genuine concern for this subject, the World Council arranged that an international conference of church women from eighteen countries be held as one of the pre-Assembly, preparatory conferences. Here the women delegates to the Assembly, and other women leaders carefully chosen, did much of the "spade work" for the Assembly committee itself.

Throughout this conference, these women came to a deepening conviction that —

> As progressively revealed by God in the Bible and in human history under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, men and women who together compose the Church, are alike Children of God, and responsible persons before God. They were also convinced that the Church will not have the fullest life nor be able to fulfill her task completely unless men and women each take their full share of responsibility and in mutuality contribute their varying gifts and capabilities. They became aware, as the experiences of many countries were described, that when men and women think and work together, new life springs up with consequences flowing from it which are only beginning to be perceived. As they struggled to glimpse God's purpose for the world today they felt themselves on the threshold of life-bringing discoveries.

When the Assembly committee on this subject began its work, it gave careful consideration to a further statement of this preparatory churchwomen's conference which said:

> We are all today in the midst of a revolution in the entire structure of society, and along every line life is expressing itself in new forms. The Church must ask itself what consequences these drastic changes will have on its own life. Our concern is especially with the man-woman relationships. The Church has been given — through the revelation of God — the true foundations for the pattern of these relations. It has, in different ages and in many instances, provided invaluable leadership in the search for this pattern. It is disastrous that at this crucial moment it has lost this leadership in many areas. By setting in its own life an example of what the right relations between men and women should be, it would render an inestimable service to mankind.
>
> Secular society today is ahead of the Church in the use it makes of the contribution of women. In the past, groups of churchwomen in many countries have formed their own organizations which have developed with varying relationships to their churches, in order to carry out the tasks they felt needed to be done and for which their churches sometimes failed to use them adequately. The great value of all this work for the Church must be fully recognized. But now the Church is awakening to the realization that woman's work must be seen as an essential part of its *own* responsibility.

Within the Assembly, both in Committee and in plenary session, it was notable that women from India and China, and men from Indonesia and Africa, gave witness of how the man-woman relationship had indeed been restudied in the light of Biblical teaching, Christ's example and the guidance of the Holy Spirit, with the result that fewer handicaps of tradition and prejudice are being placed in the way of women's full service in the Church. One felt that the West and the older churches have much to learn from those who have cast away so many of their hampering cultural arrangements and who literally accept the truth that the "Church as the Body of Christ consists of men and women, created, as responsible persons, together to glorify God and to do His will."

Professor Karl Barth was one of the most active members of the committee on "Women's Life and Work." In his *Dogmatics,* dealing with Creation, he strongly maintains an equality of men and women before God but separate functions for each, those of the women being as "consorts, collaborators and helpers of men." It was those from the younger churches — both men and women — who most strongly challenged him to accept "women as persons," fulfilling functions according to

their God-given aptitudes and gifts, including those of women whose vocation may be a full ministry of the Word and Sacrament.

IV

After a spirited discussion within the Assembly, the following main points of the Committee's Report were unanimously adopted:

1. *Voluntary Organizations.* Organizations of women within the churches afford rich opportunities for service and self-expression, and a valuable training-ground in Christian leadership. They do a great work in teaching, in social and missionary service, and in the deepening of the spiritual life. In order that these organizations may not become independent movements or substitutes for a wider participation in the life of the Church, they must be integrated into its total structure.

2. *Governing Boards.* We urge that the experience of women should be further utilized for the central life of the Church through their inclusion in Church courts, committees and boards where policy is framed and decisions affecting church life as a whole are made. We look to the World Council of Churches and the National Christian Councils to give a lead in this direction by the appointment of qualified women as members of their committees and as staff members in responsible posts.

3. *Professional Church Workers.* In order to secure the services of educated and well-qualified women with a sense of vocation for professional work in the Church, e.g., as deaconesses, directors of religious education, parish workers, missionaries, youth leaders, attention must be given to improvement in standards of training, remuneration, status and security of employment. The study and teaching of the Bible, theology and kindred subjects would be enriched by the co-operation of women.

4. *Ordination of Women.* The churches are not agreed on the important question of admission of women to the full ministry. Some churches, for theological reasons, are not prepared to consider the question of such ordination, some find no objection in principle, but see administrative or social difficulties; some permit partial but not full participation in the work of the ministry; in others women are eligible for all offices of the Church. Even in the last group, social custom and public opinion still create obstacles. In some countries, a shortage of clergy raises urgent practical and spiritual problems. Those who desire the admission of women to the full ministry believe that until this is achieved the Church will not come to full health and power. We are agreed that this whole subject requires further careful and objective study.

This section of the Report as adopted concludes: "Information and guidance in connection with these and other problems might usefully be provided by the World Council of Churches and it is therefore urged that the Life and Work of Women in the Church remain one of its particular concerns."

V

It only remains to record in what ways the Assembly has instructed the World Council to continue its work in this area and what arrangements were provided.

For the use of delegates to the Assembly, an Interim Report of the Council's study on "The Life and Work of Women in the Church" was prepared. This is to be republished for general use throughout the churches of the world and can now be ordered from the Geneva office.

In the second place, the Assembly voted that a Long Report in the form of a book on this subject is to be written, making use of the wealth of material submitted from the fifty-eight countries. For the first time since the Reformation, there will be a comprehensive account of what the women of the churches are doing and to some extent what they are thinking about their service to the Church.

The Council was instructed by Assembly vote to include a greater number of women on Commissions, major Committees and Secretariat, and to provide an adequate supply of information about women's activities in the Church.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, there is to be — as a part of the structure of the World Council — a Commission composed of men and women to give further consideration to the "Life and Work of Women in the Church"; to provide for studies — theological and otherwise — and to give guidance on important issues. One may be forgiven for ending on the extremely practical note that budget and executive leadership have been authorized for the work of this Commission.

LAYMEN AT AMSTERDAM

By CHARLES S. JOHNSON

A FIRST impression would probably be that laymen were in an ineffective minority at Amsterdam, even though virtually all women as well as all unordained men had a lay status. The impression would, undoubtedly, come from the plenary sessions, where the general speeches were made and the formal actions of the various working groups of the Assembly was consummated. But much if not most of the substantial work of the Assembly was accomplished in the preparatory and functional commissions and committees of the Conference, and notably in the four Delegates' and four parallel Alternates' Section meetings. In these the laymen made contributions considerably out of proportion to their numbers.

The general theme of the Assembly (*Man's Disorder and God's Design*) and the subsequent organization of the program, created a necessity for informed and even technical or professional lay participation. This was especially true of Sections III and IV of the program, concerned respectively with *The Church and the Disorder of Society,* and *The Church and International Affairs.*

It was very evident that the Churches have discovered that their positions can be greatly strengthened by using the specialized services of their own lay members who hold important and responsible positions in national and international affairs. This follows the notable reorientation of the Church, despite the powerful persuasions to the contrary of the great Swiss theologian Karl Barth, to a sense of responsibility and service in a dangerously disordered society.

John Foster Dulles, a lawyer and a Presbyterian layman, was one of the keynote speakers on the international crisis. He set off a chain of discussion which continued throughout the Conference in the Section meetings and in the plenary sessions. The ideological interpretations and the legal skills of such distinguished laymen as Baron Frederik Mari Van Asbeck, professor of international law at Leyden University, Kenneth Grubb of Great Britain, who served as chairman of the Delegate's Section on the Church and International Affairs, Quintin Hogg and E. G. M. Fletcher, members of Parliament in Great Britain, Gustav Walter Heinemann, burgomaster of Essen in Germany (an accredited visitor), and Sir Walter Moberly, also of Great Britain,

were powerful influences in shaping the policy and pronouncements of the Assembly on the complex of delicate issues involved in the East-West tension situation which is currently so disturbing to the world.

Interesting enough the most acute challenge to the Western political ideology came from Dr. Joseph L. Hromadka of Czechoslovakia, a minister of the Evangelical Church of the Czech Brethren, who is also a professor of theology and a former visiting lecturer at Princeton University.

The venerable Dr. John R. Mott, unquestionably a dominant spirit in the entire ecumenical movement, is a layman. He ranks with the late William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Geoffrey Francis Fisher, present Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Boegner of France, Archbishop Germanos of Thyateira, and Archbishop Eidem of Uppsala, in the fashioning of this movement, and in preparing the world and the Churches for it. The Assembly owes its intelligent and extensive press interpretation throughout the world to the superb organization and guidance of Charles P. Taft, a lay delegate from the Protestant Episcopal Church, and by profession a lawyer.

Among the 589 delegates and alternates there were in attendance a total of 182 laymen, including, of course, all women delegates, or roughly about 30 per cent. The 351 official delegates had among them 101 laymen, and in the group of 238 alternates there were 81 laymen. The count of laymen will, no doubt, vary depending upon the determination of what constitutes a layman. All women delegates had a lay status. The official *Who's Who* classed fourteen church executives serving as delegates and eight alternates, as laymen.

In Section III (*The Church and the Disorder of Society*) Charles Taft undertook a poll of the group for members who might be rigidly defined as laymen. From the group of about 100 delegates in the Section he excluded all church executives, college presidents who were also ministers; in fact, all persons directly engaged in religious work. He then counted fifteen persons who might be classified as laymen in the more accepted sense. He was quick to note that neither in the Section, nor in the Assembly as a whole, was there a single representative of organized labor. A courier was dispatched to the Trade Union Council of Amsterdam and two representatives of labor brought in and invited to speak. They lacked preparation for the sudden call and, as consequence, added little to the general current of discussion. This little experience prompted Ronald Bridges, a lay delegate from the

Congregational and Christian Churches, to the generalization that the Assembly in its consideration of social disorders was weak at both ends — in representation from labor and from management. This he speculated, may have been responsible for the absence of a sharp division of views on the issue of "free enterprise," which came in for a great deal of critical evaluation during the sessions. The one lone farmer in the Assembly came from Scotland.

Although there were no representatives of organized labor in the delegations from any of the countries, there were actually several business executives and employers. In the delegates group were five such laymen who took an active part in the Section discussions. One of these was Jeus Taftegaard, a Danish banker, and another, Frank Eugene Baker, a Pennsylvania investment banker and a Methodist delegate. Among the alternates were nine business men, including Walter Bauer, a German merchant, Henri Weber, a French industrialist, Clarence Hugo Linder, a General Electric Company assistant manager from Schenectady, New York, and Arnt J. Morland, a Norwegian ship owner. Mr. Morland told how he had introduced an adult education program, including religious education, among the crews of his steamship line. Henry Stenhouse Mance of Lloyds of London, made some very practical proposals for fostering international understanding and good will through international business associations, exchange of staff, and personal relations.

An important layman from another field was Constatin Leopold Patyn, counsellor to the Ministry of Economic Affairs of the Netherlands, who served as chairman of delegate's Section III on *The Church and the Disorder of Society*. Dr. David Elton Trueblood of Earlham College, representing the Society of Friends, had a considerable influence on the final text of the Assembly statement on War and Peace.

As for the others, college professors and presidents, lawyers, judges, and government officials made up the group. The laymen were, as a rule, out of their element in the strictly theological discussions: for example, in Section I on *The Universal Church in God's Design*. Nevertheless, they were not wholly without useful representation even in these. One of the very effective laymen in Section I was von Thadden-Trieglaff of Germany, who as commanding officer during the German occupation of Belgium had been so humane in his dealings with the people that he was invited back to Louvain after the war and given a public dinner.

The number of women among the official delegates was small and their participation in the plenary sessions restricted very largely to the discussion of the life and work of women in the Church. The marked limitation of this role, even in the new outlook of the Churches, was emphasized by the issue of ordination of women, which the women themselves did not consider it expedient at this time to challenge forthrightly. They proposed merely that the matter be studied. Among the 351 delegates, there were only 18 women, 11 of whom were listed as housewives; and among the 238 alternates there were 29 women, half of whom were housewives.

In the Section Meetings women were not without effectiveness. In the plenary sessions Dr. Georgia Harkness of Garrett Biblical Institute made valuable contributions to the discussions. Experienced organization executives including Miss Van Asch van Wyck of Holland, vice-president of the World's Y.W.C.A., Dr. Margit Sahlin of Sweden, secretary of the Church of Sweden's General Board of Voluntary Church Work, Miss Jean Begg of New Zealand who has also been associated with the World Y.W.C.A., and Miss Dina Bolegge Hegermann, an Oslo, Norway, social worker, made notable contributions to Section II, *The Church's Witness to God's Design,* and to Section III, on *The Church and the Disorder of Society.*

Miss Saroe Chakko of India was chairman of the committee on The Life and Work of Women in the Church, and successfully defended the report of the committee to the plenary session.

Two women appeared on the general program, Mrs. Kathleen Bliss of Great Britain and Mrs. Mildred McAfee Horton, president of Wellesley College and wife of Douglas Horton, one of the most dynamic and internationally minded leaders of the American delegation. Mrs. Anna Canada Swain, president of the Women's American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, addressed the very large visitor's section of the Conference and made a profound impression. Two American women, but, unfortunately for strategic reasons, no European women, are on the powerful Central Committee charged with consolidating the gains and carrying forward the results of the First Assembly.

It was the feeling of many of the women attending as delegates or accredited visitors, that both the actual participation of women and the formal opportunity for such participation were below the level of normal expectation at such a conference, and in such a time as the present.

The self-conscious self-identification of laymen in the Assembly was less impressive than their actual work as individuals. The report of the laymen's committee which met during the Conference to discuss such problems as the training of laymen in the Church, laymen's church activities, congenial and efficient means for carrying out laymen's activities and the like, was not especially distinguished. The book stalls carried fewer publications on this subject than on any other of major concern to the Assembly.

As indicated earlier a substantial contribution was made by laymen to the preparation and functional operation of the Assembly. Structural papers for the orientation of the Assembly discussions were prepared by such notable laymen as Dr. J. H. Oldham and Miss Kathleen Bliss of England, Dr. J. Ellul of France, John Foster Dulles of the United States, and C. L. Patyn and Baron van Asbeck of the Netherlands.

Among the consultants and staff were fifty-seven laymen, in largest numbers from the United States, Great Britain and Eire. While most of these were executives of religious organizations there were also among them writers, lawyers, bankers, college presidents and professors.

It may be noted that the contribution of full equipment for simultaneous translation for the entire delegation by Dr. John B. Watson, president of the International Business Machines Corporation and the fifty thousand feet of film taken by the British film producer, J. Arthur Rank, to be made available at cost or less to delegates, represented another important lay participation. Although this type of service, which helped make the Assembly both significant and effective, was not official participation, it was nevertheless, broadly in the spirit of the Assembly's present interpretation of the best service of laymen.

Section II (*The Church's Witness to God's Design*) had this to say about the new role of the layman:

> The Layman has his duties in the Church in worship and in stewardship. These do not exhaust his responsibilities. He is charged also with a task in the world outside. Some are called to accomplish the task by the ministry of intercession. For most men the field of witness lies in the place where they do their job or their profession as the instrument through which they make God known to men. Christian service is to be conceived in the widest possible terms. The variety of forms of witness is just the means by which God can make known the fullness of the Gospel as His answer to all the needs of mankind.

YOUTH AT THE WORLD COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

By PAUL G. MACY

We young people have, throughout this Assembly, been waiting upon God and have not ceased to make intercession on your behalf that God may use both you and us in His great design for His Church in the world. We want, therefore, to assure you that even though we are aware of the rather considerable difference in years and experience between you, the fathers, and ourselves, we have nevertheless felt our oneness with you in the same Lord and the same task. . . . We desire to state very clearly that we are not here to raise the old bogey of youth and age. We are called here, both young and old together, to listen to God's word and do it.

SO spoke the appointed representative of the youth delegation to the closing plenary session of the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches. Despite the fact that the 148 Churches represented at Amsterdam sent only *one* official delegate under thirty years of age, youth did play a real part — not alone through the participation of 100 special youth delegates from 48 countries but also through the international corps of ushers, many of whom had participated in the World Conference of Christian Youth at Oslo in 1947.

For one thing, the youth delegation was much in evidence since they had been assigned seats in the amphitheatre which composed the rear part of the rostrum, behind the speakers' table. They faithfully attended the plenary sessions and worship services. When the Assembly divided into sections for study, the youth group divided into four parts and considered the same themes. They presented their own set of findings on the nature of the Church and its witness in the world, and on the Church's responsibility to the social and international order. Indeed, one delegate reported that they "said some things about economic and political issues that the churches have not had courage enough to face clearly before!" And the young people did not hesitate to criticize the preparatory material which their elders had furnished, both as to emphasis and content. "In the youth groups we came more to the point than the older groups. Somehow, the older groups were trying to compromise most of the time!"

To many in the youth delegation the Assembly brought a revela-

tion of the depth of the cleavages that have kept the scattered branches of Christ's Church in relative isolation.

> We cannot express too strongly how pained we are by the divisions of the churches. . . . At every point in our discussions we were brought up against the inability of the churches to be clear and authoritative because of their disunity on the basic issue of the nature of the Church. . . . We are convinced that the time has come when the churches must speak to each other in love of the stumblingblocks which mar our fellowship and which drive men and women, *and especially youth,* away from us.

One delegate from the Near East, describing the situation as that of limbs belonging to the same body, with the same head, but broken apart and dislocated, saw the World Council as the event in which the limbs "are finally starting to be repaired and to recover. *They may actually be very near the convalescent stage!*"

The tragedy of division loomed especially large in the fact of four separate Communion Services. "It left me," writes one, "with a sense of helplessness as to our ability to bind up these wounds in the body of Christ." The report of Youth Section I says that the problem of *intercommunion* is "a *burning* problem for many young Christians." The group did not feel that it was qualified to discuss the theological implications but urged the Assembly "realistically to face up to the problem." This is one of the places where youth thinks that the oldsters are not forthright enough.

Another concern of youth, as they considered the nature of the Church, is the relationship with Rome. They were impressed with the fact that the Roman Catholic Church includes more than a third of Christendom in its membership and that "hence the absence of this Church from participation in the World Council Assembly gives us reason for humility when we speak of the World Council as *Ecumenical.*" The report goes on to contend that if the ecumenical movement *is* a *great new fact* in the history of the Church, then the Holy Spirit, will surely provide a prophetic voice which will lead to the eventual inclusion of the Roman Catholic Church.

Among the factors which make for failure in the attempt of Church members to understand God's will for them, youth finds two that they lay at the door of the clergy! One is a failure at the point of "clarification of the Gospel, especially in effective preaching." The other is the "cleavage between the clergy and the laity often caused by the attitude of the clergy in forgetting that the Church is *not* the clergy but the

clergy *and* the laity." Other points of concern are that the Church give more attention to the less privileged classes of society; that the Churches put their own house in order in administration and practical affairs; and that the Church shall neither identify social systems with the Gospel nor accommodate the Gospel to social systems but shall "preach the full Gospel which transcends nationality and race." (On race and color each of the four Sections had something to say and Section IV said that, in the preparatory material presented by the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, "color and race problems have been treated too generally" and that "in all these matters more contribution could have been made by the Asian and African leaders.")

In considering the Church's Witness to God's Design, the youth group concluded that "in order to insure a sympathetic hearing the Church must seek to identify itself with, and take a vital interest in, the whole life and environment of the people to whom it proclaims the Gospel message" and that this involves: (1) A study of the Christian faith; (2) a study of non-Christian religions; (3) a study of the presuppositions of contemporary social, political and economic systems (communism, capitalism, nationalism, etc.), especially those which have a semi-religious, and *hence idolatrous,* manifestation; and (4) an attempt to express the eternal truths of the Gospel in a language relevant and meaningful to the hearer.

(That last sentence suggests the possibility that not all of the findings of the youth group would be "relevant and meaningful" to a typical youth group in the United States. For example, note this: "The Church has to proclaim that international problems cannot be solved except by the nations acknowledging Jesus Christ as Lord. *This is not to claim a Christian program since there is no end in the political order, but to state an eschatological fact.*" [Italics ours.] One suspects, in reading the findings, that some of the ideas and language was furnished by the "senior members" of the youth group. The Youth Department of the World Council allows some of its members to be between thirty and forty and a few of any age.)

Turning now to the disorder of society, youth felt "forced to lay far more emphasis than the Assembly Commissions thought fit on the breakdown of family life." This training ground for youth in mutual responsibility and understanding and for the spiritual values of life, according to the young people, has "largely broken down in Western

society. In places like India and West Africa education of youth away from their home environment has the effect of causing a cleavage in family and communal life." The group further felt that young people, with their distinctive needs, *"do not find a satisfactory answer in the Church, either in its preaching or teaching, or in its fellowship."* This is a sweeping indictment, but the young people are very much in earnest. They go on to specify what they think ought to be done to set matters right. (Here those studying social relationships had much to say in common with those studying the nature of the Church and with its witness.) Their main conclusions were: (1) Worship and preaching must have a *more direct relationship* with the common life of men and women so that young people can find in worship a clearer view of the true ends of life. And they want to see a recovery of the sense of *joy and certainty in the victory already accomplished in Christ* as an antidote to the prevailing despair."

(2) Heal the divisions! Any Church which upholds "racial, class and other discriminations is denying the very meaning of the Christian Faith. Also — and here youth adopted the viewpoint of the Eastern Orthodox Church — *full community* is not possible where there are divisions in the Church with the consequent inability to share with each other in the Lord's Supper which is the central act of the Christian community."

(3) We need a deeper sense of Christian vocation — i.e. the Christian witness in the profession or job in which one finds oneself, as difficult as that is in some very monotonous jobs.

(4) Take a Christian view of leisure time. The young people viewed as a tragedy the use of leisure time largely for diversion, especially in mass entertainment. And they affirmed that "the constant drink habit, gambling and sexual immorality have played a large part in the depersonalization of our time."

A mere glance at the headings of the report of Youth Section IV which dealt with the disorder in international life reveals the trend of their thinking. They are: (1) The theological basis; (2) the need for repentance; (3) areas of repentance; (4) personal responsibility; (5) a return to the Bible. At many points — an instance has already been cited — the young people in this Section took their elders to task for what seemed to them grave omissions. One has the feeling that the preparatory work done by the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs reflects a good deal of the American and British point

of view, while the approach of the youth group is distinctly "continental." (Perhaps this is one reason why a distinguished leader from the Continent thought that the pronouncements of the youth group were better than those of the regular Assembly groups!) In illustration of this point note that youth considers the "emphasis of the material provided by the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs is directed too much to human rights and ideals and the passing of those rights on to the U.N.O. Unrelated ideals may, therefore, *lead to pious nihilism* . . . the stress on the ideal of liberty is dangerous unless it is linked more strongly to justice, since liberty may be true for the West but has only been enjoyed by the East as poverty. . . . The work of the C.C.I.A. should be directed inwards towards repentance and to that end a 'dialogue' should be continued between Churches in various parts of the world." All in all, the group found the official documents of the Assembly lacking in that they do not make "sufficiently apparent the authority of the Bible and the theological approach."

About thirty of the youth delegates had attended the great Youth Conference in Oslo. For them the Assembly lacked some of the drama which they had known at Oslo. There were not as many "high points" of moving experiences. There was no great choir leading the worship and the stirring hymns marked "allegro" were dragged out in andante! Nevertheless, all seemed to sense the greatness of the event as expressed by one delegate. Referring to the wonderful work done behind the scenes, to the receptions and the trip through the illuminated canals, he said: "Amsterdam was more than this. Behind these externals was the wonder of the meeting itself; the realization of the infinite possibilities of so widespread an experience. As (Karl Barth) put it: 'The realization that *all our differences were within our agreements.*' It was wonderful to partake of such a moving of the Spirit."

As had been the case at Oslo, youth was impressed with the great difference between the Neo-orthodox theological position and that held by those whom the Neo-orthodox call "liberals." But perhaps the greatest differences loomed between the points of view of East and West, based upon the differences of culture, customs and tradition. One youth delegate from the East stated quite frankly:

> All through the Assembly, as well as in the other conferences which I have attended this summer, *in spite of their very sincere efforts,* many of the Western delegates have been unable to think in terms of the East, that is, to discuss the general problems with the East in mind. Somehow it is not their concern and

their worry, even in this Assembly of the World Council of Churches, to think of the East in specific terms; yet a little more thought to that would have thrown more light on many of the problems that were discussed.

We may well let another youth delegate summarize.

The unity which is in Christ was the main note of the Assembly. From this sprang all our work: penitence for our divisions; criticism of contemporary society and everything that we did. It was summed up completely in the quiet Message of the Assembly. . . . In the moment of silence after the Message was read — surely one of the most impressive of the whole fortnight — we were able to praise God for what He had wrought.

If the Churches are wise, many of these youth delegates will be the official, voting delegates at the next Assembly!

CONTEMPORARY BOOKS

MYSTERY BEYOND MEANING

THE PROTESTANT ERA, *by* PAUL TILLICH, *translated and with a Concluding Essay by* JAMES LUTHER ADAMS. *University of Chicago Press, $4.00.*

EACH generation seems to produce only a few genuinely creative personalities. In the realm of religion and philosophy and, perhaps particularly, between religion and philosophy, Paul Tillich, formerly professor in several German universities and now at Union Theological Seminary, is definitely one of those personalities.

The present volume is a mixture of translated material going back some twenty years and more, articles written in this country, and also some new writings. The editorial unity, and for a good part the actual unity, of the volume centers around the distinctive approaches and problems of Protestantism. The central theme is then subdivided into five parts: Religion and History; Religion and Culture; Religion and Ethics; Protestantism; and The Present Crisis. The final fifty or so pages contain a comprehensive, careful and insightful introduction to Tillich's work by a competent scholar. This chapter is illuminating, perhaps too illuminating, for those who would like Tillich to be more definitely in the central Christian tradition and who have their doubts that his real interests and main contributions actually lie therein.

The heart of the work is clear: basically Protestantism is constant self-criticism in form; Christ, in content; love, in social ethics. The Protestant era as such will perhaps pass, but the Protestant principle, "the judge of every religious and cultural reality, including the religion and culture which calls itself 'Protestant' " (p. 163), will remain, for it is ever necessary to distinguish between the unconditional and the conditioned.

Both the power and the problem of *The Protestant Era* have to do with this use of "the unconditional." (*Das Unbedingte* is now most often translated as "the unconditional" instead of "the unconditioned.") The ultimate thereby seems less philosophically formal, but it is still impersonal; it is still *Das* rather than *Der*. It also lacks definitive content. Revelation as an apprehendable disclosure of the absolute is denied. Mystery therefore finally becomes more important than meaning; myth more important than doctrine. Though it is good and proper that the relative elements in all religions and cultures be adequately recognized, the Christian faith makes much more primary the fact of explicit revelation in history and the power of the Holy Spirit to interpret that revelation reliably for faith and life. The closest Tillich comes to this insight is in his use of *Agape* as the principle

capable of combining the permanence in conduct with change, but even here his affirmation peters out at the end to the effect that Agape is after all essentially undefinable. There is so much positive intellectual content in Tillich's writings, that I am sincerely grieved over this aspect of his thinking, along with certain formalisms; for instance, that eternity becomes the unity of meanings. Tillich's shedding and forfeiting of an adequate supernaturalism and personal revelation of God has made him more at home in modern philosophy and less at home in historic Christianity.

But Tillich has not finished yet. When his systematic theology is published, I hope that in his inner, honest heart he will have become more definitely persuaded of the dependable truth of the Christian revelation in its fuller dimensions. I have read this book, at least in part, more than once. It overflows with creative insights and sound practical counsels. Its analysis of history and thought is razor-keen and provocative of new orientations. In numerous instances, like the "Gestalt of Grace," the Transmoral Conscience, secularism as "the conscience of the Church," etc., Tillich reveals authentic synthetic powers; not to mention his generally known concepts like the demonic, *kairos,* etc. If such a person and thinker would only become more centered on the bedrock of Biblical faith, he could use even more compellingly his concern for and outreach toward the secular world, and his theology would have more steadiness and lift for a confused and wistful Church.

NELS F. S. FERRÉ

NATURAL THEOLOGY REVIVED

IS GOD EVIDENT? *by* GERALD HEARD. *Harper and Bros., $3.00.*

THE thinking of Gerald Heard has been an important feature of Western intellectual life for at least twenty years. It has, at the same time, been a highly controversial subject and continues so to be. Gerald Heard's mind is restless, vigorous and unconventional. His ruling passion seems to be the desire for synthesis, to include in his hypothesis that which is not native to him. British by origin and education, he has identified himself with America and particularly with California; a man of letters, he makes himself an omnivorous reader of scientific treatises; nourished in the Christian tradition, he pays very careful attention to the religions of the East, particularly those of India. An essential characteristic of his philosophy is its syncretism.

In the present volume Gerald Heard essays to deal, in a modern way, with the ancient subject of natural theology. Does the world we can see and partly know give any evidence which can provide unaided intelligence with convincing reasons for believing that this is God's world or that God is just and good? Gerald Heard believes that it does and renounces overtly the

position on this subject long upheld by Barth and partly reflected by Brunner. While he does not deny the possibility of revelation, Heard holds that the natural evidence is convincing and, indeed, made far more convincing by the emergence of new scientific knowledge which was not available to earlier writers on natural theology.

In this enterprise Gerald Heard's restless mind appears at its best. He must be one of the great readers of our time and his reading combines those very subjects which are relevant to the discussion. He has read widely in chemistry, in biology, in anthropology, in psychology. Thus he seems equally at ease when discussing thermodynamics, the decline of the dinosaur and the behavior of rats. This aspect of Heard's work has its drawbacks as well as its advantages, especially in the fact that he seems to quote too much and the references to authors, some of whom are wholly unknown to the average literate reader, is tiresome. Thus, on three pages we find the following: "As Elliot Howard in his masterly *The Nature of a Bird's World* has pointed out"; "As Dr. Rowan of Alberta has also confirmed"; "As Dr. Clement Webb remarked some thirty-five years ago"; "As Dr. H. Cohen, addressing the London Medical Society, pointed out." In several instances we are told what various important people said personally to the writer.

There are parts of this book which are exciting reading, especially those parts dealing carefully with the precise conditions which make protoplasmic life possible and the climatic changes which favored the rise of the mammals. I know of no book which presents so well what may be called the economy of nature, leading to a vigorous reaffirmation of the argument from design. The uniqueness of the earth, especially in contrast with its near neighbors, Venus and Mars, is beautifully and convincingly presented.

Heard wages consistent and continuous warfare on the two Fundamentalisms, that of Science and that of Religion. Charles Darwin, among others, is severely criticized and shown to have a certain intellectual nativeté. Though Darwin was an unusually acute observer and an honest man, he was untrained philosophically, and seemed to have no notion that he was dealing with incompatibles when he maintained the existence both of "chance" and of "mechanical determination." Darwin, Heard suggests, did not know that he was philosophizing, and thought he was merely observing.

The philosophical importance of Darwin, even to this day, lies largely in the fact that millions of literate persons suppose he made the argument from design untenable. They are not quite sure just how he accomplished this, but they assume without argument that he did so. Heard exposes this suppressed premise with great skill and candor. He points out that "today men who think they are informed and who as theologians are supposedly concerned to find evidence for God's justice and goodness, assume in the statement of their case that Natural Theology does not exist." How could

this be? Why is the teleological argument supposedly outmoded? By what argument is the concept of design rendered absurd? "It is possible that they are still taking for granted that the immense ascendancy of Darwin as a supposed thinker still renders any such proofs as unworthy even of consideration."

One of the most fascinating of the many speculations of the book is that which predicts possible changes in the earth's atmosphere with the consequent emergence of new human types. Instead of our losing our oxygen, as Mars has done, and thus becoming a rusted iron ball, we may experience in coming millennia a considerable increase in the proportion of oxygen, up to 23 percent, partly because our iron core is still giving off oxygen. In that case the descendants of contemporary men may have a more tonic environment and may, consequently, think better. "It may well mean that here we glimpse in the future a provision for just that further increase of the stimulation of the air that is breathed which would parallel a further increase of man's capacity to think, to be conscious." If this is the direction in which the climate of the earth is moving, and recent scientific studies seem to show that it is, here we have added evidence that ours is a world leading to the development of life, mind and spirit. That is part of what we mean when we say the world speaks eloquently of its Creator. The development of the earth for millions of years has been in the direction of the survival of creatures of head and lungs.

The least convincing part of this important book is that in which the author leans heavily on Eastern "wisdom." In dealing with species below man in the evolutionary scale, Heard holds that the creatures are not "individuals" at all, but, being subject to instinct and unable to learn by experience, they are guided in each species, by a special demiurge. "In the Sanskrit Indo-European corpus of teaching it is said that each species is ruled by a Deva — a creative spirit — and these gods, though they live for millions and scores of millions of years, yet in the end they die and it is they and not the supreme Brahman who create, make great beauty and manifold wonder, and also mistakes and trials, and discoveries and suffer; and finally learn and understand." Heard, in his speculation based on Eastern thought, compares the life of the species to our human individual spirits. It is our spirits that learn "and not the millions of cells that compose our bodies."

I see no profit whatever in such a speculation, even when it is admittedly speculative. It is, of course, a mysterious thing that creatures inherit "tendencies," but the whole world is mysterious anyhow. I see nothing wrong, intellectually, with the conviction that species are as they are because God has made them that way, using the method of natural selection as one of his means. The principle of parsimony seems a sound one and to introduce Sanskrit Devas into the picture is to add unnecessary hypotheses.

In many parts of the book, Gerald Heard tries so hard to avoid spiritual provincialism that he leans over backward. He pays more attention, in many instances, to Indian speculations than he does to those which have arisen in the Judeo-Christian tradition. In fact, he is wholly out of sympathy with the contemporary return to the Biblical view of life so ably expounded by C. H. Dodd and many others in Europe and America. "The Old Testament," writes Heard, "is a short and narrow tale of a provincially minded people who, as is natural with the ignorant, conceived themselves, with little objective evidence to support their prejudice, as being supremely favored by God." This is clearly intended as a red rag, but the author goes farther in renouncing the concept of the uniqueness of the Hebraic revelation. "Alongside of them, and before them, we find societies, which not merely paralleled and forestalled insights that Hebrew and Christian thought incomparable, but which went far beyond them in keenness of insight and, as far as the Hebrew is concerned, in purity of devotion." If this book is read in Europe, such a passage will undoubtedly be used, by the Confessional theologians, to show to what depths American theological liberalism has fallen.

This is an important book, which must be used by our students in the philosophy of religion. Its best use will be made by those who neglect the religious syncretism it represents and concentrate on its remarkable marshalling of scientific evidence in support of natural theology. More than any other of Gerald Heard's books, this one will find its way to reserve shelves in theological seminaries.

D. Elton Trueblood

A CHRISTIAN CYCLE OF CATHAY

A Hundred Years of China Methodism, *by* Walter N. Lacy. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, $3.50.*

THE centenary of the introduction of Methodism into China, celebrated in 1947, obviously called for a survey of its hundred years of service in that land. This, fittingly, was undertaken by Walter N. Lacy, of a family distinguished during the latest six of the ten decades for a growing share in the life of China Methodism. Materials were drawn from many quarters — from books, magazines, reports, manuscript correspondence, and personal memories of eye witnesses and participants.

At the outset one fact must be noted. The story is confined to American Methodist undertakings in China. There is no attempt to narrate the history of the extensive British Methodist enterprises in China nor those of Canadian Methodism (after it merged in The United Church of Canada). Nor are all the American Methodist bodies included: the Free Methodists are only barely mentioned. Deliberately the story has been confined to the

operations of the three bodies which in 1939 united to form the Methodist Church — namely, the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Protestant Church. This limitation is understandable and defensible, especially since in 1941 the bodies which had arisen from the missions of these three churches joined to form the Methodist Church in China. Recognition is made of the existence of the extensive work of British Methodists and brief suggestions are made (p. 252) for the achievement of a working union between the Chinese churches having American and British connections.

Very properly, the author begins with a chronological sketch of the planting and growth of American Methodism in China from 1847 to 1947. Then follow chapters on the development of education (one of the most important Methodist contributions), the extensive medical undertakings (although only two hospitals were added after 1923), the production, printing, and distribution of literature, the growth of self-support, the financial contributions from the United States after 1910, the part of women, the place of Sabbath observance and the Epworth League, the development of administrative organs and procedures, and the achievement of union in the Methodist Church of China. Appropriately the volume concludes with a survey of the Chinese leadership, of increasing Chinese participation in the work of the Church, and of the other ways in which the Methodist Church is becoming rooted in China. The final chapter is headed, significantly, "The Church Will Remain." Appropriate appendices and a full index complete the volume.

Obviously the book will be of interest chiefly to Methodists, and especially to Methodists who have had a direct share in missions in China. Yet it should have an appeal to a much wider circle. It is a well written record of the establishment and growth of an important segment of the Christian Movement in China.

K. S. Latourette

THE PROPHETS STILL SPEAK

The Witness of the Prophets, *by* Gordon Pratt Baker. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, $2.25.*

The Goodly Fellowship of the Prophets, *by* John Paterson. *Charles Scribner's Sons, $3.00.*

The Hebrew Prophetic Consciousness, *by* Harold Knight. *London: Lutterworth Press, 10s. 6d.*

HERE are the three latest books on the prophets of Israel, each very different in intent and purpose from the others, and all of them much worth one's attention. The first is by a Methodist minister in Washington

Grove, Maryland, and is essentially a series of expository sermons. The author is an exceptionally gifted writer, and the value of the book lies chiefly in the vigorous and forceful clarity of the style. The book is divided into two parts. Part I, "The Way of the Witness," deals with seven Old Testament prophets (Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Habakkuk, Jeremiah, Haggai, and Zechariah). Part II, "The Witness of the Way," is concerned with Jesus as the "heir," the "prince," and the "hope" of the prophets. There are many gaps in the treatment, but one does not expect this type of book to be exhaustively analytical. The author is a minister who has been studying his Bible, and what he has seen he expounds extremely well. The book should thus prove of considerable help to many other preachers, as well as an inspiration to them to open their Bibles and attempt to do something of the same sort.

The second volume is by Professor Paterson of Drew Theological Seminary. After a brief introduction on the nature of prophecy, each of the "writing" prophets is treated in a separate chapter (including separate sections for Deutero-Isaiah and Zechariah 9–14, though none for Isaiah 56–66). The concluding chapter is concerned with "Christ: The Goal of Prophecy"; it attempts to state briefly how the New Testament is the fulfilment of prophecy.

This is not a technical book; in disputed questions the author says what he believes and why, but does not consume much space in their discussion. The thing which impressed this reviewer most was the sanity and sobriety of the author's approach to his subject matter, coupled with the evangelical zeal which he exhibits in handling it. Dr. Paterson served the Church of Scotland for sixteen years before coming to this country in 1931. His work reminds one immediately of the type of British exposition exemplified so well in the last generation by S. R. Driver, J. E. MacFadyen, and G. A. Smith. There is little that is profound or new in the book; the treatment of a number of prophets is extremely brief; numerous points of view may be challenged; and theologically one would now desire to plunge much deeper into an analysis of the significance of what is said. Yet considering all of the obvious limitations, the reviewer would consider the volume as the best introductory work on the market for the general use of the minister who desires to preach from the prophets.

The third book is from the pen of a British writer who teaches at The King's School, Canterbury. It is much more profound than the other two, and attempts an analysis of the psychology and theology of Hebrew prophecy. In "Part One: History and Psychology" the author struggles with the problem of the origin and nature of prophecy. His thesis is that there were two types of prophecy in the ancient world, divinatory and ecstatic. The former is that from which Hebrew prophecy arose, while the latter

was an alien element which the Hebrews derived from Canaan. In the opinion of this reviewer there is little real evidence to substantiate this position. Both lay in the background of Hebrew prophecy, but the one is no more characteristic of it than the other and neither can explain it. One of the difficulties seems to lie in the writer's discussion of ecstasy. He thinks that ecstatic experience leads to mystic absorption and union with the divine, and is based upon the supposition that man is an incarnate soul which is inherently divine. Consequently, ecstasy can have nothing really in common with the faith of Israel. Yet this, to me, is an inadequate conception of ecstasy. It describes one type of ecstasy which finds expression in mysticism, but it has nothing to do with any type which existed in the pre-Roman Near East. The confusion of mysticism and ecstasy appears to me to be the source of the difficulty.

The second part of the book deals with theology, and is much more interesting. "Revelation and Authority," "The Nature of Man and Its Relation to God," "The Personality of God," "Divine Pathos," "Time and Eternity," and "History" are the topics dealt with. The author's major concern seems to be the vast difference which exists between Hebrew prophecy and either mysticism or Greek rationalism; his discussion on this point is very instructive.

G. Ernest Wright

HISTORICAL JUDAISM, IDEALIZED CHRISTIANITY

The Religion of Maturity, *by* John Wick Bowman. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, $3.00.*

EVER since the fission between Judaism and Christianity began to be final, there have been two rather different motifs in the discussion amongst Christians of the inevitably poignant problem of their relation to the Jews. On the one hand, there was a lively concern to claim for Christianity a full and valid right to Israel's heritage of Torah and prophecy; to maintain the essential continuity between the Old Covenant and the New; to preach Jesus Christ as the climactic fulfillment of God's revealing acts in and for Israel; to view the Jews with a sense of deep spiritual kinship and a lively hope that they, too, would come to acknowledge Jesus as Messiah and Lord. This tendency is to be seen in Paul, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Origen (and, in a different perspective, in the so-called "Clementine Recognitions"). It was also the controlling impulse in the Christian rejection of Marcionism. On the other hand, one may observe a less worthy interest in making invidious comparisons between Christianity and Judaism and in emphasizing the discontinuity between them; the tone of this polemic is

one of ill-concealed disdain and the most familiar instances of it are in the *Epistle of Barnabas* and, more mildly, in the *Epistle to Diognetus*.

Professor Bowman's *Religion of Maturity* is a contemporary attempt to deal with this age-old problem. One naturally asks which, if either, of these two earlier motifs the book reflects. The unsurprising answer is that both are present, but unsymmetrically. Despite an apologetic disclaimer in the preface (p. 10) and several subsequent qualifications, the net practical effect of the book is a disparagement of Judaism-in-its-historical-performance in praise of an idealized Christianity. One must hasten to add that there is no apparent malice and no conscious disdain. Nevertheless, Judaism fares badly at Bowman's hands and this is due, at least in part, to a lack of profound and sympathetic understanding.

He begins with a very fine summing up of the role and import of ethical prophecy in the religion of Israel and then attempts to show that this "prophetic word" is *the* uniquely normative element not only in the Old Testament but also in Jesus' experience and conception of religion. All else is either *adiaphora* or *spuria*. This "all else" is then schematized into three separate religious types which, taken together, comprise Judaism. The first he calls "the religion of the altar," which represents the priestly element in Hebraic and Jewish religion. The second is called "the religion of the book" by which is meant the rabbinical devotion to Torah and its exposition. The third is "the religion of the throne" and this refers to Jewish apocalypticism (and, by plain inference, to its Christian exemplars as well). Each of these "religions" is, in its turn, shown to be seriously defective, and this particularly in the light of Jesus' appraisal of them. But since the elements of priestcraft, scribism and apocalypticism are so inextricably involved in Judaism as a whole, it must be judged an immature religion, ministering to "an egocentricity which is detrimental alike to the cause of true religion and to the production of a godlike personality" (p. 260).

It was Jesus and the Christians who really recovered the full measure of sensitivity to the prophetic form of revelation-and-response and thus "created the 'way' of incorporation of the divine word in the 'redemptive community' so that the latter becomes the divine act fulfilling the former." This is "the religion of maturity" (p. 273). Christianity thus supersedes and transcends the "religions" of Judaism. "The church need never return to the religion of the altar . . ." (p. 309). "Nor need the church return to the religion of the book . . ." (p. 310). "Again, the church needs no more of the religion of the throne" (*idem*).

The chief practical corollary of this general thesis is an earnest injunction to Christians that they be prophets all and thus to mold the world's life "to the end that 'all flesh shall see the salvation of God' " (p. 315). In

this connection, Bowman proposes to amend the Oxford Conference's familiar aphorism, "Let the Church be the Church":

> The expression is a good one but not quite good enough. It is a bit too abstract and smacks too much of the "theology" classroom. "Let the Christian be the church in his situation" — this is perhaps better and certainly more concrete. Let the Christian, in whom is the dynamic life of the Spirit of his Lord, be the church wherever he finds himself — in his social and economic, in his educational and religious, in his political and international groups. Let him live that life and show the courage and declare the gospel solution which is the only true and inevitable and Christian way under the circumstances, even as the church of the New Testament did in its generation before him.

This book has been acclaimed co-winner of the $7500 Abingdon-Cokesbury Award for "books which will accomplish the greatest good for the Christian faith and Christian living among all the people." The publisher's dust-jacket commentator finds it a "solid, competent book." There is some warrant for such weighty tokens. The profound and sustained appreciation of the prophetic element in the Old Testament and the skill and diligence with which the evidence for the import of this tradition in the mind and message of Jesus has been gathered and interpreted, are noteworthy and valuable. The author's conception of the religion of maturity, as distinguished from this particular application of it, is of great significance. And the chapter on "The New Wine of the Gospel," taken by itself, is an excellent statement of the ethical substance of Jesus' teaching.

Nevertheless, many disquieting queries remain. Less serious, for example, is the question of how one should react to the solemn assertion that the Hebrew prophets "would have sung with fervor Maltbie Babcock's hymn: 'This is my Father's world . . .' " (p. 52). (I've tried this quotation on half-a-dozen colleagues and they have all greeted it with baffled smiles.) More seriously, what is one to make of the patently biased discounting of the meaning and significance of apocalyptic and eschatology? What is one to say of this singular disjoining of prophetic revelation from its organic connection with cultus, Torah and the seer? Is one supposed to take this schematism of the three false "religions" and the one true one as a serious contribution to the history of the Jewish and Christian communities? And how is one to value the victory won for Christianity by so shallow an understanding of the spirit and genius of Judaism and of the essential continuity between Torah and Incarnation?

The thesis "that Christianity is the religion of maturity" (p. 15) is fundamentally credible. But this particular attempt to show how, why and in what sense this is validly to be understood, can hardly be deemed successful.

ALBERT C. OUTLER

GANDHI'S OWN STORY

GANDHI'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY, THE STORY OF MY EXPERIMENTS WITH TRUTH, *by* M. K. GANDHI. *Public Affairs Press, $5.00.*

THE subtitle, which seems to have been the title originally given it by Gandhi himself, is the more correct description of the contents of this interesting volume. It is autobiographical in that Gandhi has dictated these reminiscences at the instance of his friends; but the volume is not an autobiography in the sense of a full account of his life in perspective. It stops some twenty-seven years ago, and so contains only the beginnings of the struggle for India's independence, which was his crowning achievement and which places him among the great nation-builders of mankind.

The book is a series of detached incidents in Gandhi's life presented more or less in chronological sequence, and of his somewhat unrelated observations on a variety of subjects — marriage, sexual intercourse, the relations of parents and children, diet (much on this!), education, various religions, particularly his own convictions concerning self-restraint, fidelity to truth, love-force and non-violence, non-co-operation with a disapproved law or government, and the like. At times one feels one's self in the presence of a profound soul in possession of wisdom, at other's listening to a crank exalting his hobbies into eternal truths. But throughout one is held by the sincerity, the genuine humility, the self-dedication, the courage of the man.

The book was written in Gujarati for Indian readers, and presupposes familiarity with many events and personages little known to Western readers. It should have been published with brief notes on the happenings and figures referred to. One has to do considerable guessing, as one reads. But here is an invaluable set of comments on Gandhi's experiences in South Africa, where his devotion to his fellow-Indians and his fearless and intelligent battles on their behalf were his preparation for his yet greater work in his own land. He is ever an intense nationalist, although during many years he was also a steadfast upholder of the British Empire. He was a combination of unworldly saint and shrewd politician, with the harmlessness of the dove joined with the wisdom of the serpent. He liked even the men with whom he had to contend, and apparently was often well liked by them.

He was born and reared in a sect of Hindus whose tenets require respect for every living creature — even for the lowliest and most humanly troublesome insect. That faith dominated him throughout life, and helps to explain his religious convictions. His own integrity of soul and personal purity are uppermost in his thought. The fact that his dietary regime demanded much trouble of those who entertained him did not deter him. He insisted upon imposing his views on his wife and children, often regardless of their wishes. In retrospect he justifies himself, but one sometimes feels that his justifications reveal an uneasy conscience. It is difficult for a Western reader to sympathize with much of his reasoning.

But the fact remains that here was a man whose soul-force has been a transforming factor in the life of his people. Throughout his career he was a dedicated spirit. In this lay the secret of his vast and ever-growing influence. The man casts a spell over us even when we smile at some of his ideas. He was fortunate in having to deal with the British. A prominent Hindu leader in conversation said to me: "Gandhi's non-violence worked with the British for they are inherently gentlemen. They rarely would use violence on passive-resisters. But other peoples — our own Moslems, the Germans or Russians — would have mowed us down."

Gandhi does not speak disparagingly of Christianity, but he usually takes a very unfortunate illustration of it — a Plymouth Brother for instance — and makes his views typical of the Christian faith. One feels that he never fairly tried to understand it, or perhaps that its connection with forces he rightly hated prejudiced him against it. He was completely satisfied with his own particular form of Hinduism, and convinced that for a Hindu to look at another faith was a betrayal of his nation. Gandhi's frequent remarks on the good in all religions reveal a very undiscriminating appraisal of the distinguishing characteristics of each.

This is not the final book on Gandhi. We lack the valuations of him by others, and his own modesty hardly lets him do justice to his enormous victories. There are, however, moving sections when we feel the extraordinary power he exercised, and cannot withhold our admiration.

HENRY S. COFFIN

AMERICAN CHURCHES EXPLAINED TO BRITISH CHRISTIANS

THE AMERICAN CHURCHES, AN INTERPRETATION, *by* WILLIAM WARREN SWEET. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, $1.50.*

DR. Sweet is pre-eminently America's greatest authority in American Church history. This book easily ranks as the best on this theme. It was occasioned by the author being asked to give the famous Beckly Lecture before the British Methodists. This Lecture requires that the principal theme be the social gospel.

While the author states that it is his purpose to include "the principal factors which have made organized religion in America what it is today," it would appear that the selection of factors and the treatment of the same is strongly influenced by the Lecture requirements. Among the factors thus treated are those in connection with the triumph of "left-wing Protestantism" in colonial America; religion winning the West; revivalism; multiplicity of denominations; the Negro's religion; Roman Catholicism, and activism. This reviewer can not understand why the Fundamentalists and

the premillennialists, who make up more than one half of America's Protestant church membership, were not included. These along with the quietists and the Barthians, both of which are discussed, are this nation's outstanding religious groups that are conscientiously opposed to the social gospel. The two World Wars greatly augmented especially the premillennialists. And the end is not yet. Behind all these are such factors as a mediaeval type of scholastic dogmatism and a non-historical critical approach to the Scriptures. American Christianity has a superabundance of both.

Another serious omission in the opinion of this reviewer is the historic fact that present day American Church life includes very much of activism of the so-called "social gospel" type which is whole poles removed from, if not opposed to, the very heart and soul of the historic Gospel as proclaimed by John Wesley and every other really great Christian social reformer. I refer to modern humanism which, just now, is happily on the decline.

The foregoing observations are made purely in the interests of correct historical reporting. Very likely, Dr. Sweet found himself severely limited both for time in the lecturing and for space in the printing. Every chapter is a masterpiece in clear lucid writing. Every observation or conclusion indicates the very maximum of thoroughly justified decision. The footnotes are exceptionally valuable. The chapter on Roman Catholicism is superb. In a very compelling and interesting manner Dr. Sweet has succeeded in producing that which will remain a classic among books intended to introduce the Church life of this nation to the people of another.

GAIUS JACKSON SLOSSER

THE LARGEST AMERICAN CHURCH

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE METHODIST CHURCH, *by* NOLAN B. HARMON. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, $2.75.*

METHODISM, *edited by* WILLIAM K. ANDERSON. *The Methodist Publishing House, $2.00.*

AT the 1948 session of the General Conference of the Methodist Church more forthright and determined interest in the general ecumencial movement was evidenced than heretofore. In the Episcopal Address which opened the conference a clear ecumenical call was issued:

> Our people are weary of discussion that has seemed to be a defense of our denominational ways rather than a discovery of His divine way. . . . We speak with the authority of experience. We have achieved union. The experience of Methodists in a united Church validates faith in the larger union.

This perspective provides a fruitful context within which to review the above books. All persons and denominations interested in exploring union

with Methodists and in ushering in "the larger union" will study the above books with profit. Dr. Harmon significantly dedicates his volume to his comrades of the Old Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, "who in October, 1940, met in their last Conference, set their affairs in order, made disposition of their precious documents, provided for the care of their Conference claimants, told each other good-bye and went immediately into four different Conferences, where they continue to serve to this day loyally and efficiently and all without missing a single step in the forward march of Methodism." A thorough knowledge of the Methodist Church, its origins, history, emphases, organization, and agencies will be indispensable for any one wishing to achieve Church unity without missing a single step in the forward march of ecumenism.

Dr. Harmon's work is a handbook of Methodist organization clearly outlined and lucidly described, with sufficient interpretation to aid in the understanding of basic issues dealing with faith and order. There are five parts dealing in turn with episcopacy, the conference system, the jurisdictional division, Methodist law and the Judicial Council, and the executive agencies of the Church. Especially to be commended is the skillful and authoritative method of tracing historic development prior to unification in 1939 and then relating historic development to present working structure. It falls outside the purposes of the book to show how the Methodist Church is related at present to the many ecumenical bodies in which Methodists are active. However, it would greatly enrich the uses of this volume if it had not only a narrowly structural or costitutional emphasis, but also a broadly functional one. In this latter respect the book falls short of the *Discipline* where these wider relationships deserve the attention at least of the Appendix.

The other volume, *Methodism,* edited by William K. Anderson, and written by twenty-five leaders, not all of them Methodists, supplements the previous volume in many ways. It has three parts dealing with early developments, distinctive emphases, and with twentieth-century Methodism. The essays are packed with basic information regarding the Methodist Church and deserve, like the book by Harmon, a wide circle of readers. Students of ecumenical problems will be especially interested in W. W. Sweet's account of "Methodism's Debt to the Church of England" in Part I, and in all of Part III. L. Harold DeWolf leads off with a searching discussion of "The Doctrine of the Church" and deals with such fundamental issues as the purpose of the Church, the relation of the fellowship to the Kingdom on earth, the renewal of brotherhood, the nature of church membership, the authority of the Church, the means of grace, and the ecumenical Church. Dr. Harmon contributes an analysis of the practices and ideals of Methodist worship, relating these to the Prayer Book, to the orders of worship, to the

current liturgical revival and to other present trends. Bishop James H. Straughn writes on "The Episcopacy." Bishop John M. Moore relates "The Story of Unification." Dr. Charles E. Schofield discusses "The Church Since Unification." Bishop Ivan Lee Holt outlines the present status of "Methodism and Ecumenical Christianity." Then follows Dean Luther A. Weigle's essay, "The Challenge of the Future: An Outside View," which is followed by "The Challenge of the Future: An Inside View," written by Bishop Francis J. McConnell. According to the latter's view the tendency toward growing centralized authority in all varieties of unification movements needs to be tempered by a pluralistic regard for the participating units. There is shrewd historical wisdom and broad possible contemporary application in the following comment:

> It never would have made for ecumenical Methodism to have tried to keep American Methodism under the direction of English Methodism. . . . Wesley is dead but his type of control isn't dead; Francis Asbury is dead but his independence of will is not dead, and Wesleyanism and Asburyism get along best apart.

WALTER G. MUELDER

ANGLO-CATHOLICISM AND CHURCH UNITY

LAMBETH AND UNITY, *by* LOUIS A. HASELMAYER. *Morehouse-Gorham Co., and Dacre Press, Westminster, $2.75.*

THE CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA, *by* LOUIS A. HASELMAYER. *Morehouse-Gorham Co., 75 cents.*

THESE books were issued for the American Church Union, an important Anglo-Catholic group within the American Episcopal Church. They represent further contributions to the effort of Catholic-minded Episcopalians to clarify both for themselves and for others their relationship to the Reunion movement among the Churches. It is from one point of view fortunate that Dr. Haselmayer's calm and scholarly presentation of the case for the Catholicity of the Anglican Communion has appeared at this juncture. For few people not in close touch with Anglo-Catholic circles realize the degree of alarm with which such Reunion schemes as that of South India are viewed by thousands of sincere and devoted clergy and laity throughout their Communion. Proposals of this kind have caused much heart-searching and agony of spirit. Dr. Haselmayer states with justice that "those within the Anglican Communion who are firmly convinced of its Catholic character – the Catholic doctrine, discipline, and worship set forth in the Anglican formularies of The Book of Common Prayer, the Constitution and Canons, the Ordinal, The Articles of Religion – have been through twenty years of distress of soul, mind and spirit." Further,

they have been charged with needless obstruction of the Ecumenical Movement of modern times, with bigotry and obscurantism. It may be said with truth that there have been all too few attempts on the part of Protestant churchmen to understand that for the Catholic in the Episcopal Church "Catholicity" is identical with "Apostolicity" and that its essential elements are looked upon as being incapable of change or sacrifice, since they are in the High Church view, ordained by the Lord for His Church.

Dr. Haselmayer is willing to admit in the same moment that he affirms the Catholic character of the Episcopal Church that historical Anglicanism has tolerated wide differences of opinion among its adherents. Catholics are content to remain within the Church because of their conviction that *officially* at least this Communion stands on the Catholic side in all important matters. For example, the only ministry authorized to administer the sacraments is an episcopally ordained ministry. This position is safe-guarded by the Ordinal, the Canon Law, the Articles and other formularies. Individual bishops and priests may, it is true, see fit to recognize the validity of non-episcopal ordinations but, while the formularies remain, there can be no official recognition. Indeed private recognition is theoretically subject to severe canonical discipline were it to include such sacerdotal acts as non-celebration of the Liturgy. This system which includes both an official stand on such matters and freedom of private thought has, it is recognized, worked fairly well within Anglicanism. But the moment attempts are made to effect union with non-episcopal Churches the system breaks down, since most of these Churches remain unwilling to accept an officially Catholic position.

Because of the impasse there have been attempts at compromise. An example of this was the interpretation given the historic Chicago Quadrilateral by the Lambeth Conference of all Anglican Bishops in 1888. Dr. Haselmayer declares that "instead of keeping to the Chicago Statement (of the American Church) that the elements of the Quadrilateral were *inherent parts of the sacred deposit* (of faith and order) *and therefore essential to the restoration of unity,* it declared that they supplied *the basis on which approach might be, under God's blessing, made toward reunion.*" This subtle alteration has, according to the author, resulted in a "total theological deterioration of the Quadrilateral." Hence it is possible for many Anglicans to insist upon the retention of the Historic Episcopate in one breath and in the next affirm that the Office has no required theological basis. But this does not square with the official Anglican formularies which declare in effect that the Episcopate, as the successor of the Apostolate, alone possesses the power of ordination. "This sacramentally creative power constitutes the unity and continuity of the Church. . . . The administrative offices of the Episcopate derive from these facts, but they are not the causes of these facts."

And Haselmayer goes on to say that "we cannot ask Christians to accept the Catholic Ministry merely as a means of Church government. We can only ask them to accept the Catholic Ministry because it is a sacramental life-giving organism, safe-guarding and reproducing in successive generations the reality of Catholic doctrine, discipline and worship." The Anglican Catholic, if he is to remain honest, must insist upon this position. There can be no compromise. But this does not mean that he closes all doors to Reunion discussion — as indeed the history of Anglo-Catholicism shows. It is just because the unity of Christ's Church is so terribly important to him that he continues to insist upon those elements organic to its life which, through the power of God, not only protect unity but create it on ever higher levels.

Dr. Haselmayer must, in accordance with his own principles, approach the South India United Church with grave misgivings. He feels that the plan of union "attempts to combine divergent ministerial traditions without first reconciling divergent traditions of doctrine." Yet this has been the approach of Lambeth since its ill-fated reinterpretation of the American Quadrilateral. He feels that those elements of Catholicism retained by the union were so diluted as to be ineffectual contributions to the life of the South India Church. Furthermore, the participation of Anglicanism in the scheme is open to serious question from the point of view of the Canon Law, "and the actual procedure by which the final vote was effected involved unconstitutional actions, hasty decisions, and extremely close majorities. The Church of South India did not spring into being with the whole-hearted and joyous blessing of the Anglican provine of India, Burma and Ceylon." To add to the confusion there has been much bungling and side-stepping on the part of the Anglican Primates of England in their attempts to determine the status of former Anglicans in the united Church, of members of the united Church not formerly Anglicans, and of future communicants of the united Church. The author feels that the 1930 Lambeth decision which declared that entrance into the South India scheme is not an act of schism and implies no censure upon any person, ordained or not ordained, should be radically revised despite the fact that two of England's Primates (Temple and Fisher) have sustained it. He holds that the future of the Anglican Communion might well be imperilled if former Anglicans are allowed as individuals to retain communicant status and left free to pass to and from the Anglican Church and the Church of South India. "Charity and justice are in tension in every ecclesiastical issue. The background of the Church of South India would suggest that Anglican principles have been violated." Hence the policy of the Anglican Bishops must be so formulated that an over-worked charity in this matter may be brought into proper balance with justice.

The present reviewer of these two books finds himself in general sympathy with the position taken by Dr. Haselmayer. It would seem almost inevitable that the "addition and subtraction method" of achieving unity will result in the loss of certain features of Catholic Church life necessary to the realization of a truly united Church. This is, in part, due to the distance separating most Protestant Churches from those principles held by Catholics to be organically related to the inner life of the Church. Nor can the fragments of empirical Church life be brought together by blue prints however carefully drawn. Church unity, like the Church herself, is a mystery. It comes only through the life-giving sacramental action of God who is pleased to work through history — and not merely general history but the most particular history of cult and holy office as well as the prophetic word. But Protestants will never grasp the essential meaning of the Episcopate if they continue to look upon it as an administrative office. It is, rather, a matter bound up with the most intimate life of the Church, her Baptismal waters, her eucharistic Offering, her solemn consecration of men and places and things. It lies at the heart of that well-spring of deep sacramental powers which is Christ Himself. One may not tamper with that well-spring lest the precious powers be lost at a time when the children of men stand in such tragic need of them. The Church is primarily a community in which God accepts men and in which men accept each other in Him. But acceptance involves personal meetings on the sacramental or depth-levels of life. The Bishop, along with the Eucharist and the other mysteries of God, is a part of the archetypal and tradition-hallowed symbolism of acceptance. He is a Father, a Shepherd who holds the staff of Christ; he is not a committee or a presbytery or a Convention. These sacramental offices which include not only the ordaining and consecrating powers but also the power of absolution are to be found in the Catholic Churches. Protestant Churches make no claim to possess them in the Catholic sense. If they did they would cease to be Protestant. It is therefore a matter of crucial importance that Anglo-Catholics continue their fight, in the spirit of charity and justice, to maintain the Catholicity of the one Church which well might, in the Providence of God, become the Mediating Church.

On the other hand one has the feeling that Dr. Haselmayer and his party either ignore or do not understand some of the great religious discoveries of the Protestant Reformation. Recent papers and essays coming out of Catholic circles in the Church of England reveal a tragic misunderstanding of the Protestant concepts of justification and faith. For an eminent Anglo-Catholic and leading monk to call the Protestant idea of faith "subjective" and "purely mental" reveals an abysmal ignorance of the sixteenth century. Catholics in the Anglican Communion have yet to admit the possibility of profound religious creativity in Protestantism and that the depth of insight

of a Paul Tillich, and many other far too numerous to mention, has much to say to Catholicism.

Reunion must come as a mighty up-surging movement initiated by the Divine Spirit. The Cluny and Franciscan revivals were such movements. We must cease looking upon it in terms of dollars and cents, efficiency and numbers, or even world crisis. Dr. Haselmayer is looking upon Reunion on levels deeper than these. For that reason he is worth reading — although with care.

C. Kilmer Myers

THE "CHURCHLY" USE OF THE BIBLE

The Authority of the Biblical Revelation, *by* Hubert Cunliffe-Jones. *The Pilgrim Press, $2.50.*

THIS book is a much needed appeal for a theological exposition of the Bible. The author acclaims the achievements of the literary and historical scholars of the Bible who have labored during the last two centuries and a half. But he deplores the attitude that the literary and historical study of the Bible are complete within itself. The historical approach to the Bible, taken alone, is theologically defective. The historical approach represents a proper beginning. We can never go back on the achievements of modern Biblical scholarship. But if the Bible is to be properly understood and appropriated as the standard and rule of Christian faith, the achievements of modern Biblical scholarship must be taken up into a positive theological exposition of the Bible.

The author properly makes clear, first of all, what he means by the authority of the Bible. The Bible has *educational* authority in that it supplies information. But more important than its educational authority and of primary concern in this book, the Bible has *final* authority in that it shares in the authority of God by declaring his gospel. The Bible does not possess primary authority in itself. It "derives its authority from the gospel and it has been created by the gospel." Since the gospel also produced the Church, and the Church decided upon the Canon and perpetuates the study of the Bible through its love and teaching; "it is only in the context of the life of the Church that the Bible is properly understood."

The appeal of this book for the theological study of the Bible is in the interest of the "churchly use" of the Bible. That is, the Bible must be made available to the ordinary believer and non-technical Biblical scholar for their own spiritual nurture. If this is to be done the scholars must study the Bible anew on the basis of interaction between the historical and theological approach to the Bible. Modern Biblical scholars have been immersed "in the difficult and intricate problems of the understanding of the original

meaning of the Scripture at the academic level." Their approach has been mainly *analytic*. They now must help the theologian and other Christians to develop a *synthetic* understanding of the Bible. "The churchly use of the Bible means the use of the Bible as a whole and as it stands."

"Theologically, the Bible is a completed unity." The author contends that if the Bible is to be the standard and rule of faith, the Christian believer must combine the historical with the theological study of the Bible. To the Christian believer the *final* authority of the Bible is subject to the judgment of Christ. Unless the Christian believer, therefore, can view his Bible as a theological unity he cannot accept the Old Testament "as part of the standard and rule of Christian faith, because it falls below Christian levels." The theological study of the Bible, in interaction with the historical, will enable us to read the Old Testament in the light of the New Testament and thus gain the perspective of faith. It will also enable us to read the New Testament in the light of the Old Testament and thus to connect the New Testament with its proper roots. This latter is also essential because apart from the Old Testament the story of Christ is easily assimilated with non-Christian philosophy.

If the historical study of the Bible is to be taken up in a positive theological affirmation of the testimony of the Bible to the revelation of God, the history of interpretation and the tradition of the Church must also be taken into account. The relatively recent scientific study of the Bible is not the whole of the interpretation of the Bible. The tradition of the Church must be taken into account because "the Bible comes to us in the setting of the practice of the Church and that practice sheds light upon the fundamental meaning of the Bible." If a living tradition sheds light on the meaning of the Bible, it might also have significance for the constitution of the Canon. Dr. Cunliffe-Jones suggests the need of a theological doctrine of the Canon and accepts the fact that minor alterations in the historical Canon are conceivable.

The author inserts a chapter on "The Bible and Natural Theology," but this chapter is mainly an argument with Dr. Karl Barth, having little, if any, relationship to the basic thesis of the book.

The last three chapters of this book concern the significance of "The Witness of the Holy Spirit," "The Bible as the Word of God" and Jesus as Lord. These chapters all constitute a discussion of the final authority of the Bible and ought, therefore, to have been placed at the first part of the book immediately following the chapter on "The Principle of Authority."

Dr. Cunliffe-Jones' appeal is one of fundamental importance. Since theologians in recent years have become more Biblically conscious and Biblical scholars have become more theologically conscious, his appeal ought to meet an immediate response.

GEORGE D. KELSEY

DIVINE FIRE BURNING COLDLY

THE RELIGION OF PHILOSOPHERS, *by* JAMES H. DUNHAM. *University of Pennsylvania Press, $4.00.*

THIS meaty volume by the dean emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Temple University is obviously the precipitate of years of labor and reflection. Not only the "religions" of ten eminent philosophers, ancient and modern, are brought under review but also the exegesis and criticism of them provided by modern scholarship. If Aristotle is under scrutiny, so also are the views of his commentators, Zeller, Jaeger and Ross; if Epicurus and Aurelius, then also Bailey and Guyau; if Leibniz, so also Nourrison and Russell; if Spinoza, Hume and Kant, then also Martineau and Hallett, Kemp Smith and Webb.

The author does not employ as presupposition any single definition of religion, and he exhibits no marked preference for any particular philosopher's religion. Nor does he attempt systematically to show the superiority of "the religion of philosophers" to any other type of religion. The title is not meant to remind the reader of Pascal's familiar apostrophe, *"Fire.* God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob, not of the philosophers and scholars."

The basic concepts of Western philosophy — e.g., substance, God, unity, reason, motion, sensation, freedom, the good — are expounded critically and comparatively. Extensive attention is given also to the arguments for the existence of God. The most striking interpretations appear in the treatment of Plato, Augustine and Comte. The author argues that Plato's "ideas" are logical concepts and not transcendental entities. Accordingly, the residues of Orphism in Platonism are ignored and dualism is reduced to a vanishing point. Augustine's refutation of the Skeptics is presented with cogency, mainly on the pattern of Gilson's exposition. "Truth is an independent essence, it is God himself." But Augustine as a philosopher of history is only feebly appreciated. Comte's religion of humanity is ingeniously presented as based upon an extension of the ontological argument for the existence of God; his *Grand Être* is viewed as a spurious unity or substance, an elevation of the human race (or perhaps of the French nation) to the status of a growing God with the divine attributes of wisdom and power. Comte's God, humanity, is thus considered to be at best a poetic fancy, a postulated Deity *who is to be* and not a Being *who already is.*

Considering the author's recognition of Comte's distinction as the father of sociology, it is to be regretted that he makes no attempt to search out the possibilities of a sociology of the religion of philosophers. To be regretted also is the fact that the author interprets the influence of Christianity mainly in the direction of supernaturalism and of the exaltation of personality.

On the whole, the book offers a painstaking and critically sympathetic exposition of the arguments and attitudes recurrent in the "religions" of the non-tragic, Pelagian philosophers. For the most part one finds here the conventional, abstract "attitude of distance." But this attitude is not the only one to be found in "the religion of the philosophers." Let it be no sign of ingratitude for what the book does offer if we express the wish that the author had given added dimensions to this substantial survey, by presenting the religion of a Pascal or a Kierkegaard (or of one of their elective affinities). Another equally significant dimension — the dimension of prophetic religion — could have been added by rendering an account of a religious philosophy that illuminates institutional life in the context of what Karl Marx called the relation between theory and practice. Such an account would set forth the religious meaning and necessity of deliberate, responsible involvement in the struggles of the social-historical process. In those dimensions, so to speak, one encounters the consuming fire that burns but does not burn out.

JAMES LUTHER ADAMS

NEW CHURCH SCHOOL READERS

MEN CALLED HIM MASTER, *by* ELWYN ALLEN SMITH. *Westminster Press, $2.00.*
THE KING NOBODY WANTED, *by* NORMAN F. LANGFORD. *Westminster Press, $2.50.*

THERE are many evidences of new life in the field of Christian education, not the least of them being the pioneering now being done in curricula for use in the church schools. Many of the church presses and educational societies are now engaged in producing curriculum materials which show great improvement in content and in format over the lesson sheets and chromo cards to which most of us were accustomed.

Behind this new pioneering is a significant growth in the whole philosophy of religious education through the past decade or more. The current use of the term "Christian education" rather than the earlier "religious education" indicates the growing concern with those matters of faith that are the unique possession of the Christian religion. The new work in this field is more Bible-centered than in the 1920's and is much more heartily concerned with the basic teaching of Christian faith. The extremely situational and pragmatic philosophy that prevailed in religious education circles in the 1920's is clearly giving way before the currents of theological change.

The Westminster Press and the Presbyterian educators are venturing in this new expression courageously, with the introduction of permanent cloth-bound reader-books for use in the church schools.

The two books of this present review are part of that contribution. They

are lives of Christ rewritten from Biblical materials and adapted to special age-groups, the first being for junior high school boys and girls, the second for those of elementary school age. For the Smith book the scheme of Mark is followed, beginning with the baptism. The Langford book begins the story, as Matthew and Luke do, with the birth. Both volumes draw generously from all the Gospels and furnish practical tables of reference.

The stories are beautifully told in current language with some use of direct quotation.

The art work and jackets are unusually attractive, and great pains have been taken to make the pictures authentic to the times they represent.

While these books were designed originally for use in the church schools, their educational purpose consciously includes the home. After their use as current curriculum pieces, they are offered to the general public through the retail book trade, where they will merit a wide reception as children's religious literature of an unusually high order.

GEORGE M. GIBSON

WHEN IS A REVISION A REVISION?

REVISION OR NEW TRANSLATION? "THE REVISED STANDARD VERSION OF 1946." A COMPARATIVE STUDY, *by* OSWALD T. ALLIS. *The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, $2.00.*

THE reader of this book should start at Chapter IX. There the question is raised, Is the Revised Standard Version a "Liberal" Version? The answer of the author is a doleful but emphatic affirmative. A "Liberal" is one who does not hold the theory of verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, for there is no other kind of inspiration and therefore one who denies verbal inspiration denies the authority of the Scriptures and the trustworthiness of their words.

That the committee of Revisers were obsessed by a "determination not to be fettered by the *ipsissima verba* of Scripture" (p. 144) is shown by a multitude of examples throughout the book. It is proved that the Revisers have inserted words and omitted words; that they have substituted clear words for obscure words, singular words for plural words and vice versa; that they have tried to fashion verbal consistency where the divine original was verbally inconsistent. And all this free dealing with the text, this tampering with the *ipsissima verba,* proves the liberal theology of the Revisers, their unbelief in the unique authority of the Bible, and their unfitness to translate the Scriptures or to revise a translation. This is the theological approach of the author of this book.

Dr. Allis was for seven years the teacher of the Old Testament disciplines at the Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. He retired from

teaching in 1936. His book on the RSV must have required much work. It shows careful painstaking effort. Dr. Allis has meticulously compared the RSV with the King James Version and the English Revised Version and the American Standard Version, with Weymouth and Moffat and Goodspeed, with the Berkeley version and often with Ballantine. The comparison is applied to 395 verses or passages in the New Testament. The presentation of the results is clear. The point of view is also clear. It is primarily theological. It is definitely fundamentalist.

The author's purpose is to show that the RSV is not a revision worthy to stand in the great tradition of the KJ and the RV, but only a new translation, one of several "modern speech" versions. And that word "modern" is loaded with an emotional charge that has serious theological implications for Dr. Allis (p. 13). So his pages contain many indignant and several sarcastic exclamation points. Unworthy motives are imputed to the members of the Revision committee, and they are accused of being inconsistent, dogmatic, arbitrary, dishonest, finessing, desemitizing, given to misrepresentation, and out of harmony among themselves. They are not "broadly representative of Evangelical English-speaking Protestantism" (p. 12), and so the reader of this book gets a dignified dose of rather high-grade fundamentalist censoriousness.

Professor Allis loves and reveres the KJ, its "Biblical" diction and its "Biblical form of expression," the "cadence" of its antique pronouns, its "thou" and "ye," its italics and all. The makers of the KJ, it is implied, were verbal inspirationists and did not arrogate to themselves that lamentable freedom from "the phrasing of the original" (p. 65) which makes the RSV so unreliable and so unevangelical. They believed, as the makers of "modern speech" versions do not, that there is a "truly Biblical attitude to the Bible" (p. 13). The Bible is a unique book and therefore in every language it should have its own "form of expression," whether in Hebrew or Greek, or seventeenth century English or twentieth century English, even if it does require "a little mental effort" for the reader to understand it.

There is a chapter of examples to show that the rendering of the RSV is too free to be accurate. Another chapter discusses "idioms" in translation, such matters as the use of italics to indicate inserted words, and the use of the second person singular. In the chapter on "Words and Their Meanings" Dr. Allis admits that even the KJ was not always consistent and translated the same Greek word with different English words. The chapter on "Word-Order in Translation" essays to prove through many interesting examples that the RSV was "simply concerned to show his independent attitude toward the Greek text" (p. 95). Chapter VI, "The Form of the Translation," discusses punctuation, capitals, paragraphing, and quotation marks, and here is where the makers of the RSV are caught in the act of

"finessing." In the essay on "Dogmatism and Inconsistency" the "meticulous accuracy" of the Revisers is held up to ridicule.

The author's net conclusion is that the Revisers and publishers of the RSV are wrong in "representing it as the legitimate heir and proper successor of that time-honored and time-tested version," the KJ. "We hold that it is only proper and right to point out that simple fairness and honesty demand that the name be changed" (p. 156). As a matter of fact there have been just and legitimate criticisms of the RSV and the Revisers admit them, but very few of these criticisms are cited in this volume. For every impartial reader of this book, *Revision or Translation,* one result will probably be an ardent desire to see the RSV and the KJ in parallel columns so that the average Bible reader may judge for himself of their respective merits and use the one through which God speaks the Gospel of Christ more clearly and more directly to his heart.

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ

MEMORIAL TO A GREAT TEACHER

THE BIOGRAPHY OF A MIND — BOSWORTH OF OBERLIN, *by* ERNEST PYE. *Published by a Memorial Committee, $8.00.*

THESE two volumes are a worthy memorial to Dean Edward Increase Bosworth of Oberlin. The first volume is an interpretation of the man and his mind. The second consists of nine addresses which he gave at the School of Religion in Athens on "The Christian Religion and Progress," plus eight studies and nine addresses, which document the thought of this creative thinker right up to the moment of his death. Pye was the experienced president at Athens when the lectures were delivered; he had earlier been the dean's secretary.

These volumes are like a shrine, patiently wrought, in great beauty. One stands before it and is at first conscious of the detailed craftsmanship of the builder of the shrine, which unavoidably dates itself and shows the mind of the architect as well as that of the enshrined. Further thought makes it plain that here are really enshrined the mind of the disciple's master in a manner as careful as it is affectionate, but never fulsome or sentimental. One who studied under Dean Bosworth finds here the very stuff of his thinking and his personality — though this work makes no pretense of being a biography. As one reads the second volume, one finds that the first has so introduced him to many a Bosworthian oracle as to make it strangely familiar when it is found in its original setting in Volume II. Besides some of us were privileged to watch the panorama of the dean's progress.

As a college freshman, this reviewer met Bosworth in the fall of 1901, when the dean was forty, and seemed correspondingly mature; and it was

his privilege to be within the close circle of Bosworth's influence until 1917, when the dean was fifty-six, and in his prime. However, during the next decade Bosworth's mind continued to move from strength to strength, as these volumes make plain. In the early years of the century we at Oberlin debated the theocentric position of President Henry Churchill King as over against the dean's more Christocentric point of view. We tried to reconcile immanentalism and the idea of a transcendent God. We could, if we would, study biological evolution in an atmosphere conducive rather than hostile to religious development. As a result, much of the theological bickerings of recent years have seemed irrelevant to those who were fortunate enough to be students of teachers as great as these two, and others in full sympathy with them. More than one of us climbed the stairs to the dean's office wearily, the weight of the world on our shoulders; but we tripped down those same stairs a few moments later wondering whatever had so greatly perturbed us. Such was the magic of his friendly spirit.

These books show the secret of that magic. "The daily practice of immortality makes the small frictions of life to be the small things they really are." "There are three elements in the development of personal power: a growing sense of God; a growing sense of human brotherhood; a growing sense of immortality." To acquire such elements seems entirely possible, but few people ever acquire so large a measure of all three as the dean did.

In the midst of social cataclysm, wars and rumors of war, fear, hatred, confusion, and the struggle for power (political, economic, military), here are two steadying sentences that sum Bosworth's thought: "There is all about us a friendly, vital energy called the Living God, steadily working upon human life to make friendship, brotherhood, universal and secure throughout the human race." "Human life is a situation devised by the infinite ingenuity of God, in which to train sons for an inheritance of power by teaching them to use power in a friendly spirit."

Here are 781 pages of stiff, but rewarding, reading, to be done slowly, thoughtfully, gratefully.

Ross W. Sanderson

LUTHERANISM RESTATED

What Lutherans Are Thinking, A Symposium on Lutheran Faith and Life, *edited by* E. C. Fendt. *The Wartburg Press, $3.50.*

THAT Lutherans are thinking, all along the whole theological front, is the considered judgment to which a reviewer of this book is led. In Biblical study, doctrinal interpretation, practical theology and ethics, evidence of critical reflection appears. *What Lutherans Are Thinking* is the composite contribution of twenty-eight representative professors from the

various synods of the Lutheran Church in America. "Not all Lutherans have exactly the same viewpoint. . . . Yet that which is common to Lutheran minds is more significant than that in which they differ," writes the author of the essay on "The Lutheran View of Christian Ethics." The editor puts it: "The aim of the book is to let the light of the past shed its rays upon the problems of the present and into the darkness of the future. That light for Lutheranism is Jesus Christ, who speaks to His Church through His Word and to the world through His Church."

The first essay, "The Heritage of Lutheranism" sets the doctrinal tone in terms of the formal and material principles of the Reformation: "The Word of God" and "justification by grace through faith." Luther is quoted to suggest the interrelation between these two principles: "The Bible *is* the normative Word of God, and it *contains* the saving Word of God" (p. 39). The discussions on the Scripture and Biblical criticism tend in the conservative direction but are not fundamentalist. Luther's own approach toward a critical study of the Bible is declared to have "preserved him from both liberalism and legalism. . . . Anyone holding to this Lutheran principle of justification by faith in Christ may examine the hypotheses of Higher Criticism without fear of losing the Word of God" (pp. 60–1).

The adherence to Confessional standards by the Lutheran Church in America is well attested by the authors of this book. In the chapter devoted to a study of "The Symbols of the Church," however, it is insisted that whereas the "confessions have become dead letters in the church whenever they have been neglected or celebrated simply as museum pieces, they have also become dead letters whenever they have been interpreted with such rigid literalism that the consciences of men have been burdened with intolerable doubts and scruples" (p. 359). The bibliographies attached to the essays vary in their general usefulness: some are narrowly denominational, others are broad and inclusive, presenting the most significant books in the field, regardless of school.

The article on "Lutheran Unity" indicates that ecumenicity has a double significance: (1) the achievement of a sense of solidarity and some measure of effective united action among the Lutherans of the world (ecumenical Lutheranism), and (2) participation in the ecumenical movement leading toward the formation of the World Council of Churches. Whereas it is reported that Lutherans in America have made much greater strides in the former area than in the latter (only two groups, the United Lutheran Church and the Augustana Synod, having contributed to the latter), the author is hopeful that, "in any closer fellowship of American Lutherans there will assuredly be voices raised in behalf of an ecumenicity which extends beyond synodical mergers" (p. 385).

ALLEN O. MILLER

THE MORPHOLOGY OF SCHISM

THE BYZANTINE PATRIARCHATE 451–1204, *by* GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M., S.P.C.K. *Macmillan, $3.00.*

EXCEPT to specialists, the history of the Eastern Churches after the early General Councils too often remains a closed book, though now and again unexplained figures of Patriarchs and Emperors appear in the background of the course of events in the West, or the East crosses our narrative in connection with some heresy or schism. The positive importance of Byzantium is increasingly realized by serious historians, and the Byzantine Church deserves similar attention. Brother Every's attractive and scholarly account should be welcomed by all interested in ecumenical activities, since it deals largely and fairly with the origin of divisions which we are now endeavoring to heal and must therefore be willing to understand.

After an admirable brief survey of Byzantine civilization and the place of the Church in it, Every follows the Church of Constantinople and its relations with East and West for the eight centuries after the creation of the Patriarchate in 451. Unions and divisions between different national Churches provide the main thread, which should make the book of special interest to the readers of this magazine; in fact apart from its own significance, a study of the morphology of schism and related matters should have a practical value. The different devotional attitudes and doctrines of man expressed in the Christological controversies parallel some of our modern divergences of tradition, the struggle for independence of the Bulgarian Church in the ninth century suggests the experience of later Younger Churches, the note that had Armenia been further away from Constantinople the Armenians might have been as orthodox and as independent as the Georgians (p. 72) is reminiscent of current divisions along political lines. Finally the lasting break between Constantinople and Rome revolves around our very modern problem of the proper kind of organ of world-wide Christian unity. Every makes full use of recent research on the ninth-century schism and brings in some of his own interesting inquiries on East-West relations in the 11th and 12th centuries. The main point in each case is that the break was not as sharp as commonly represented in textbooks; in particular the crisis of 1054 was not so much the beginning of a general schism as an unfortunate effort to renew contacts which had scarcely existed for two generations, after the failure of which the division slowly spread and hardened until complete by the end of the Middle Ages. Every is one of those who believe they see what was wrong with Western insistence on the *filioque*, namely a tendency to view the Holy Ghost mechanically, — and he may well be right.

As with all learned works, there are a few slips and misprints (the funniest

of the latter being "Pobiendonsteff," p. 199). But there are remarkably few of either for a book dealing with a subject of many complexities, and the author has put us in his debt with a sound and clear sketch of an area of great importance for Christian understanding.

E. R. HARDY, JR.

DISCONTINUITY WITHIN CONTINUITY

AMERICA'S SPIRITUAL CULTURE, *by* BERNARD E. MELAND. *Harper & Brothers, $2.50.*

ONCE again a competent writer has undertaken to diagnose the cultural situation in America. Dr. Meland's approach is at once religious and secular. That is to say, while he is primarily concerned with the influence of religion upon the cultural stream, he assesses the "spiritual dimension" of the culture as a whole and finds an authentic spiritual quality in the secular order itself. Out of this conjunction of interests comes the thesis of the book: that a new basis must be found for relating religion to the corporate life of the community — one that is not comprehended in the formula of separation between church and state.

It is unusual for a thinker with a definitely naturalistic orientation to write so incisively of the effect of the secularization of modern life: "The peace between church and state in the American commonwealth has been a costly one for both state and organized religion. It has reduced religion to a social activity upon the periphery of public affairs and has left the state to pioneer its course in the perspective of a secular society."

Yet the author's argument is by no means a conventional one. He is not calling us "back" to anything. The church he regards as a feeble spiritual resource. "To individuals within their respective traditions it can minister; but to society as a democratic culture, struggling for its life and for the realization of its ends, the church as an insulated tradition seems to have no significant voice." He even refers to the recent churchward procession of noted intellectuals as a retreat on the part of tired and disillusioned minds for whom "the human scene is too much." Neo-Thomism and neo-Protestantism are both criticized, though for different reasons, while hope is seen in a critical liberalism that draws on the Renaissance tradition, rejecting a "final and absolute discontinuity between religion and nature" but recognizing "discontinuities within a total pattern of continuity." This makes room for the "insights" of the Protestant theologians who stress transcendence and opens the door to "the Creativity that is shaped by God into meaning and value." This conception stands in contrast to a "naturism that makes continuity the dominating principle of religious thinking." It denotes the spiritual dimension of the culture.

This reviewer has spent a considerable amount of time among philosophers and educators who tend toward this "naturistic" view, and with whom "pre-occupation with pure science becomes a devotion." He has also attended the recent meeting of the Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam. Perhaps the seemingly unbridgeable chasm between the two outlooks will ultimately be spanned by the philosophic approach indicated by Dr. Meland. "The scope of man," he writes, "the creature participating in a venture of cosmic proportions, must be recovered in our thinking. The reality of suffering and tragedy and the overcoming of the tragic sense through grace and redemption must again be made vivid to us."

But the new synthesis must be a "compromise." The culture cannot be church-controlled, yet the church must be seen as an actual "instrument of society" — not merely as the bearer of celestial visitants — for maintaining "an active life of devotion to God." One feels, however, that Dr. Meland expects much less from institutional religion than from the mobilization of spiritual resources in education and in home life, spurred on by the nascent force of cultural regionalism.

F. Ernest Johnson

NOTE AND COMMENT

THE HEART OF THE WORLD COUNCIL'S MESSAGE

. . . There is a word of God for our world. It is that the world is in the hands of the living God, Whose will for it is wholly good; that in Christ Jesus, His incarnate Word, Who lived and died and rose from the dead, God has broken the power of evil once for all, and opened for everyone the gate into freedom and joy in the Holy Spirit; that the final judgment on all human history and on every human deed is the judgment of the merciful Christ; and that the end of history will be the triumph of His Kingdom, where alone we shall understand how much God has loved the world. This is God's unchanging word to the world. Millions of our fellow-men have never heard it. As we are met here from many lands, we pray God to stir up His whole Church to make this Gospel known to the whole world, and to call on all men to believe in Christ, to live in His love and to hope for His coming.

Our coming together to form a World Council will be vain, unless Christians and Christian congregations everywhere commit themselves to the Lord of the Church in a new effort to seek together, where they live, to be His witnesses and servants among their neighbours. We have to remind

ourselves and all men that God has put down the mighty from their seats and exalted the humble and meek. We have to learn afresh together to speak boldly in Christ's name both to those in power and to the people, to oppose terror, cruelty and race discrimination, to stand by the outcast, the prisoner and the refugee. We have to make of the Church in every place a voice for those who have no voice, and a home where every man will be at home. We have to learn afresh together what is the duty of the Christian man or woman in industry, in agriculture, in politics, in the professions and in the home. We have to ask God to teach us together to say No and to say Yes in truth. No to all that flouts the love of Christ, to every system, every program and every person that treats any man as though he were an irresponsible thing or a means of profit, to the defenders of injustice in the name of order, to those who sow the seeds of war, or urge war as inevitable; Yes, to all that conforms to the love of Christ, to all who seek for justice, to the peacemakers, to all who hope, fight and suffer for the cause of man, to all who — even without knowing it — look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.

Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end.

(Adopted by the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches, September 4, 1948)

THE NATURE OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

A Statement by the First Assembly, September, 1948

I

The World Council of Churches is composed of churches which acknowledge Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. They find their unity in Him. They have not to create their unity; it it the gift of God. But they know that it is their duty to make common cause in the search for the expression of that unity in work and in life. The Council desires to serve the churches, which are its constituent members, as an instrument whereby they may bear witness together to their common allegiance to Jesus Christ, and cooperate in matters requiring united action. But the Council is far from desiring to usurp any of the functions which already belong to its constituent churches, or to control them, or to legislate for them, and indeed is prevented by its constitution from doing so. Moreover, while earnestly seeking fellowship in thought and action for all its members, the Council disavows any thought of becoming a single unified church-structure inde-

pendent of the churches which have joined in constituting the Council, or a structure dominated by a centralised administrative authority.

The purpose of the Council is to express its unity in another way. Unity arises out of the love of God in Jesus Christ, which, binding the constituent churches to Him, binds them to one another. It is the earnest desire of the Council that the churches may be bound closer to Christ and therefore closer to one another. In the bond of His love, they will desire continually to pray for one another and to strengthen one another, in worship and in witness, bearing one another's burdens and so fulfilling the law of Christ.

II

With respect to public prouncements, the Council regards it as an essential part of its responsibility to address its own constituent members as occasion may arise, on matters which might require united attention in the realm of thought or action. Further, important issues may arise which radically affect the Church and society. While it is certainly undesirable that the Council should issue such pronouncements often, and on many subjects, there will certainly be a clear obligation for the Council to speak out when vital issues concerning all churches and the whole world are at stake. But such statements will have no authority save that which they carry by their own truth and wisdom. They will not be binding on any church unless that church has confirmed them, and made them its own. But the Council will only issue such statements in the light of God's revelation in Jesus Christ, the Lord, and the living Head of the Church; and in dependence on the power of the Holy Spirit, and in penitence and faith.

22,356

534